

97
REMARKS
ON TWO
CHARGES:

DELIVER'D

By the LORD BISHOP of *L——d*
and *C——y*, to the Clergy of his
Diocese.

Smallbrook (A.) Bp.

WHEREIN

The DANGER of the CHURCH, from the Progress
of Liberty, and its INDEPENDENCE upon Civil
Government, are considered.

In a LETTER to his LORDSHIP.

By a Friend to TRUTH and LIBERTY.

*Illi qui modo præsunt in Ecclesiis, plurimum sunt Fures & La-
trones, plus Exactores quam Pastores, plus Spoliatores quam
Tutores, plus Mactatores quam Custodes, plus Perversores
quam Doctores, plus Seduciores quam Ductores: isti sunt
Nuntii Antichristi, Subverfores Ovium Christi. ALBERT. in
Johan.*

*Rara Temporum Felicitas, ubi sentire quæ velis, & quæ sentias
dicere licet. TACIT.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for M. STEEN, in the *Inner-Temple-Lane*.

M. DCC. XXXVIII.

(Price One Shilling)

REMARKS

ON

CHARGES

DEBENTURES

by the Lord Bishop of A——
and C—— to the Clerk of the

Diocese of

THE





REMARKS ON TWO CHARGES, &c.

My LORD,

HAVING lately met with, where I least expected any thing of such a Nature, some *Fragments* of two *Charges*, delivered by your Lordship to the Clergy of your Diocese, my Curiosity led me to enquire after and peruse the Performances throughout. Your Lordship's known Skill and Zeal in all the Branches of *Church-Heraldry*, and *Power*, your profound Erudition, and exact Knowledge of all the Fables of the *Ancients* concerning *Hobgoblins* and *Fairies*; of their Whims, allegorical Reveries, and caballistical Dreams and Visions, join'd with a *warm* and *sincere*, I can't say *disinterested* Concern for the Establishment of Tythes and Orthodoxy, very much raised my Attention. Upon the Perusal it appears that Liberty would be in as imminent Danger from your *Lordship's* Model of Christianity, as you apprehend the Church to be from the Progress of Liberty, and the downfall of Usurpation, Tyranny, Superstition, and spiritual Bondage. Without any servile Fear therefore, tho' were I to pay such a slavish Respect to any, I know none that would be *more deserving* of it than your *Lordship*; I shall examine some of the most material Particulars contained in these Charges to your Clergy. Had either of them fallen sooner into my Hands, it might have engaged earlier Animadversions.

B

Probably

Probably it will be urged, 'tis *Infidelity* or worse, to expostulate on any Points of this Nature with a Bishop of the Church. 'Tis allowed an awful Deference is due to your Lordship, and those of your Lordship's Character, whose peculiar Province is, to be *in the right*, and whose Business is, *never to be mistaken*. These are Blessings of an uncommon Size, when held without the *absurd Claims* of Infallibility. But still as *Christians* 'tis our *Right*, as *Protestants* 'tis our *Privilege*, and as *Englishmen* 'tis our *Glory*, that we dare judge for ourselves in matters of Faith and Religion. When we consider ourselves under these several Relations, there can be no virtue in blind-folding our Understandings. Passive Obedience is equally odious in *Church* and *State*, whether it be to the Will of an *arbitrary Prince*, or the Dictates of a *tyrannical Clergy*. I need offer no farther Apology for the honest Freedom I shall use in the following Address to your Lordship.

In the Introduction to your first Charge, 'tis observed, "that * the good Providence of God removed you from your former Diocese to your native Country." I shall not take upon me to enquire whether it was a good Providence to your Lordship, or to the Clergy of that Diocese you were removed from, or to both together. But, my Lord, you must allow me to be a little ludicrous upon proper Occasions. It puts me in mind of a Country Clergyman, who, upon leaving the Flock committed to his Charge, observed, in your Lordship's Dialect, that the *good Providence* of God had removed him.— A poor Parish-Boy took occasion to ask the *Reverend Ambassador*, if Providence had called him to a *lesser* Benefice, or a more *advantageous* Situation. To the *Latter* be sure, replies the Man of God ; so I concluded, says he, or Providence might have called ever so loud and long before you

* Charge 1. p. 3.

you would have condescended to have given it an *Answer*. The Lad you'll admit must be one of *Woolston's* Disciples, and was sliding towards Infidelity apace. What will become of *priestly Prerogative*, if Men are suffered to make such saucy and wicked Reflections? But the Application I leave to your *Lordship* and the intelligent Reader.

In the next Page * you go on thus; " I shall now proceed to another Subject that is too *seasonable* in our present Circumstances to be past over in Silence; I mean, upon due Consideration of the State of our national Church. I shall now shew how we may most effectually, in our several Stations, contribute to its Support, and be best qualified for the Defence of it, against the open Attacks, and dark Designs of its Adversaries, of whatever Denomination."

What the Church in *danger*, my Lord? The Perfection of Beauty, and the Joy of the whole Body of the *Clergy*, in *danger* of falling? If so, 'tis reasonable that the Solemnities of the Pulpit should propagate the Alarm, give Authority to our Fears, and that in our several Stations we should exert our joint Endeavours to remove them. But whence, my Lord, arise these *chimerical* Representations? Have we not a *Prince* on the Throne, whose good Inclinations, as well as *royal Word*, engage him to *preserve inviolably* the Liberties of all his Subjects? Are we not happy under his auspicious Government in the *free possession* of many valuable Blessings? Have we not Persons of great Worth and Integrity, that sit at the Helm, and if there are any there of a *different Character*, yet they have been always true to *their Principles and the Times*, and as tenacious of the Rights of the Church, as your *Lordship*? Have not all the visionary Schemes of a *Rival Pretender* to the Crown, been long since baffled, and his

* Charge 1. p. 4.

Hopes blasted for ever? Are our national Concerns in this happy Situation, and yet the national Church groaning under the bitterest Extremity and Distresses? — You would not have it believed that when our Rights and Properties are most *secure*, when the wisest Laws are enacted, and those Laws executed without *Partiality* or *Corruption*; when *Reason* triumphs over *Craft* and *Superstition*, your Lordship would not have it believed, that under such Circumstances the Church is under the greatest Danger? Can the Church never be safe, unless the *Laws*, *Learning*, and *Liberties* of the Nation are brought into Wreck and Ruin? These ill-tim'd, or in your Lordship's Phrase, *seasonable* Alarms, may fill the Minds of the Clergy with Sedition, and their Mouths with Rage and Clamour: But can they ever contribute to recommend Virtue, to establish rational Piety and Religion?

'Tis observable that the Cry of the Danger of the Church, has always been made use of more or less in *exact Proportion* to the *Progress* of common Sense, and the *Declension* of a Spirit of Bigotry and Bondage. But, my Lord, such Reports come with an ill Grace from the *Friends* of the Church, how entertaining soever they may prove to its *Enemies*. The Church of *Christ* encountered the severest Difficulties, and the warmest Opposition. It had not only the *Magistracy*, but the *Mob* and the *Priesthood*; the *High-Church Dignitaries* of the *Jewish* Constitution, join'd in a Conspiracy against it; yet the spiritual Weapons of Truth, Honesty, and Disinterestedness overpower'd them all. And as to future Ages, we are expressly foretold, the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it. What means this, my Lord! Are the Interests of the Church of *Christ*, and the Church of *England* not only *distinct*, but *opposite* in their very Nature? One *always safe*, t'other *always in danger*? One, proof against the
raillery

raillery of Infidels, and rage of Hell ; t'other trembling at the Efforts of a few *bot-headed Enthusiasts* and *Dissenters* ? Then surely, according to your *Lordship's* Scheme, they cannot be very near a-kin. However, I would be understood to speak with due Reverence to the *Cassock*.— Let them be one and the same, notwithstanding all this, and what the Priests have join'd, let no Man put asunder.

About the time your Lordship's first Charge was delivered to your present Diocesan Clergy, among others who attacked Christianity with little Sincerity, and less Success, Mr. *Woolston* an *Apostate Clergyman*, was one of the most considerable, * whose Name I presume is not forgotten by your Lordship. Probably his Discourses are the *poisonous Libels* you refer to, † “ against the Infection of which, proper Preservatives were used.” But what Preservatives did your Lordship judge proper on that Occasion ? Were you conscious of any *Weakness* or *Insufficiency* in your *elaborate* and *bulky* Defence of Christianity, that you fled for Refuge to the secular Arm, and called to your Assistance the *salutary Aids* of a Fine and a Dungeon ? I have been informed, that *ludicrous* Writer declared upon his Trial, that our late *worthy Metropolitan* expressed himself thus, with relation to that unchristian Prosecution ; for should I call it Persecution, the World would never believe that *Bishops* had any hand in the matter : Mr. *Woolston*, I am sorry for your Sufferings, but had you wrote ten times as much against *Christianity*, without attacking *clerical Authority* and *Power*, you had been *safe* and *unmolested* still.— However that be, permit me to observe, my Lord, and with an *honest* Concern for the Honour of Christianity I speak it, this very Conduct gave a *greater Reputation* to Mr. *Woolston's* *Ribaldry*

* See *Woolston's* Answer to the Bishop of *St. David's*, dedicated to the Queen.

† See Charge 1. p. 4.

*baldr*y and *Distraction*, than it could otherwise have obtain'd ; and even a greater than your *Lordship's* *writing* against him. 'Tis natural to shew *Compassion* for those who suffer for any *peculiarity* in their *Notions*, to be prejudiced in favour of their Cause, and to express a *generous Indignation* at the Authors and Abettors of their Sufferings. Was Mr. *Woolston* delivered over to the Jailor, to be buffeted for the Salvation of his Soul, or the Suppression of his Libels ? A Dungeon could never enlighten his Understanding ; and *Infidelity* rejoiced in such a *favourable Opportunity* of spreading abroad the *inglorious Fame* of his Imprisonment and Writings ; not to mention, that as Truth *stands* not in need, so it *scorns* such *wicked Arts* to support its Authority.

As I have no Concern with the *History* of the *Puritans*, I shall take no farther notice of your Remarks on that Head, than what necessarily comports with my Design to expose the *Wickedness* and *Folly* of claiming a Jurisdiction over Conscience ; and invading the *Monarchy*, the *universal Monarchy* of Earth, as well as Heaven. 'Tis observed, that * the long-ago *confuted* Pretensions of the old *Puritans*, are brought afresh on the Stage. Were not their Pretensions founded upon the same Principle with the Reformation itself, the *Right of private Judgment*, and acting according to it in matters of Religion ? Will your *Lordship* deny this ? Who then *confuted* their Pretensions ? No Friends to the *Reformation*, to the *Church of England*, would attempt it ; and did they, I hope your *Lordship* will agree with me in this, such Attempts would have been vain and fruitless. True, they had many *wild antic Extravagances* among them ; and a *gloomy Idiotism* that usurped the name of Virtue, which still prevails amongst many of their Successors and Disciples.— They worship'd God as if the Devil was in them ;

* Charge 1. p. 5.

them ; but still the distinguishing Principle they separated upon, was a generous Zeal for and a noble Attachment to the *Liberties* of their Country. But I forbear to make Way for the Danger of the Church. —* “ The virulent Reflections on the

“ two renowned Archbishops *Parker* and *Whitgift*,
 “ the late Attempt on the *legal Maintenance* of the
 “ *Clergy* by *Tithes* ; those latter ones on the Disci-
 “ pline of the *established Church*, and the legal Ju-
 “ risdiction of the Governors of it, in concurrence
 “ with the Growth of Infidelity, Prophaneness,
 “ and Immorality—The *Numbers* of those that
 “ are *Unbelievers*, or are for no *Establishment* of
 “ Christianity at all, or are *disaffected* to the *present*
 “ *Establishment* of it amongst us; from these Views
 “ we can’t but have some *melancholly* Thoughts
 “ concerning the final Issue and Result of Things.”

My Lord, cheer up your Spirits, *melancholly* Thoughts often issue in a *fixed settled Delirium*. Witness the *Craftsmen* of *Ephesus*. Their Zeal for their Goddess, and her silver Shrines, soon improved itself into a *venerable Frenzy*, and a *consecrated Riot* ; so that they knew not wherfore they came together: The Men were *mad*, but still they were *profoundly orthodox*, my Lord.—’Twas not the Goddess that they worshipped, but the very Object of Priestly Adoration throughout all successive Ages.—Her *Silver Shrines* ! But the particulars referred to, deserve a closer Examination. Can a faithful History of the Character of one or two *renowned Ecclesiastics* be a Reproach upon their Order ? If so, what the *Poet* observed as to *Priests* of all *Religions*, may be justly applicable to *Priests* of all *Ages*, that they are the same ; inspired with the *same Lust* of Dominion and Power, the *same Thirst* for Blood, the *same Zeal* for Knavery and Persecution.—But whatever your Lordship may think, I can’t

can't fall in with so *wild* an Opinion. As Truth can never suffer by exploding *dark unscriptural* Systems, or as *Physic* can never be brought into Disgrace by a just Contempt of *Quacks* and *Empirics*; so neither can the Church be ever hurt by an honest Representation of Characters or Facts that tend neither to its Security or Honour. "The late Attempt "on the legal Maintenance of the Clergy by "Tithes," likewise awakens your *Lordship's* Resentments. Supposing, my Lord, there had been any Regulation of Tithes, would this have brought the Church into Danger? Would there be no *Priests*, no *Bishops*, were there no *Tithes* no *Establisshments*? Is all the *Devotion* of the *Clergy* bound up in these, my Lord? It seems, 'tis the same as to *Ecclesiastical* and *military Squadrons*, and that the *Prowess* of the *Church* as well as of *Armies*, depends upon good Pay and *Provision*; and those who are enlisted into the Service of both alike, may fight for *Hire*, but will desert their *respective Posts*, if there be no other Reward than the Prospect of being serviceable to their Country. But if the Church be in any *Danger*, there are some more probable Reasons to be assigned for it, than those which are pointed at by your Lordship. Is there no *Danger* from *Bigotry* and *Superstition*; from *Church-Pride* and *Tyranny*; from the *illegal* and *arbitrary Pretensions* of *insolent Ecclesiastics* *? Is there no *Danger* of its being brought into Reproach from *Bishops* that never *preach*, from *Divines* that never *study*, unless it be how to *aggrandize* themselves, and *oppress* the *Laity*, by their high exorbitant Claims as to *Ecclesiastical Fees* and *Revenues*? Is there no *Danger* from the rigid uncharitable *Imposition* of *forged Creeds* and *Formularies* upon the Christian People? Is there

no

* Of what avail the Abolition of Paganism, if we still retain the worst part of it, and have an Army of Christian Priests, that delight in Bloodshed and Confusion? Ch. 1. p. 26.

no *Danger* from the Clergy's *swearing* to, or at least *subscribing* Doctrines as true, which they believe to be *false* and *unscriptural*, and being guilty of *solemn Perjury*, in the name of the Lord? Is the Church in no *Danger* from that little *awkward Stiffness* and *Pedantry* of Behaviour; from that *Fury* which wears the *Mask* of *Zeal*; from that *Disaffection* to the *Protestant* Family on the Throne, which your Lordship can't be ignorant of, *reigns* among a considerable Part of the *inferior* Clergy? Is there no *Danger* when the Church has a greater share in our *Merriments* than in our *Prayers*; when our *Zeal* for it grows *warm* in our Cups, but *stagnates* in our Devotions? — These are such Reasons for the *Danger* of the Church, as well deserved your Notice; and which, my Lord, as a *Christian Bishop* at least, you had done well to consider. — But I ask pardon, your Lordship's Fears may arise from *another* Quarter.

If we take a view of the Reign of *King Charles* the Second, we'll find that *Infidelity* and *Prophaneness* were never so rampant in the Land as then, from the *Reformation*, down to the present Times. Upon the *Restoration*, the Flood-gates of *Hell* and *Rome* seemed to be let open upon us. And yet in that *blessed Æra*, the Church was prosperous and flourishing; the *Priests* pampered with *Luxury*, and no Complaints known of *Danger*. But when *Liberty* and *King William* ascended the *British* Throne, its Complaints were renewed, and excepting a short Interval in the following Reign, have been continued ever since.

Your *Lordship* complains of the Growth of *Infidelity*; nor, according to the modern use of the Phrase, are your Lordship's Complaints needless! We have Multitudes in this Nation, and may the Number *daily increase*! that don't always *believe*, neither *worship* the Clergy. It has indeed

been the Complaint of every Age, the former Times were better than these. The Cry is as *stale* as 'tis *common*. But do *Infidelity*, *Immorality*, and *Prophaneness* grow? What can be the reason of this? Are the *Clergy*, who ought to be the *Advocates* of Christianity, and *Guardians* of our Liberties, grown more ignorant than in former Times? Or are they grown more *profligate* and *wicked*? Do their *Lives* make *Atheists*, or their *Doctrines* *Slaves*? Whatever *Infidels* may pretend, your *Lordship* will not suggest this? In the Body Politic, *wicked Governors* and a *corrupt Administration* propagates Corruption among all inferior Ranks of Subjects: And is it not the same as to Religion? — Are the Times *bad*? — 'Tis your *Lordship's*, and the *Clergy's* Business to make them better. 'Tis in your power to reform the World, to bring virtue into *Fashion*; and 'tis with an *ill grace* Men complain of Evils that are of their own begetting? Is it Matter of Fact that the number of Unbelievers daily increases? What Account is then to be given of the Vigilance and Conduct of a *pompous spiritual soldiery*, retain'd for the Service of the Church and Truth? Are they not blessed with national Honours and Preferments? Is not the World prejudiced on their Side? Have they not the Advantage of a good Cause, and yet after all, an *unequal match* for a *few naked* Unbelievers? Surely, my Lord, they ill deserve to be kept in constant pay, who are either too lazy to fight, or too unskilful to conquer, when the Opposition is so weak and trifling. Superstition has been generally the Parent of Infidelity; and the long-ago exploded Absurdities and Traditions of Divine Right, uninterrupted Succession, &c. which have been vamped up afresh, and retailed abroad by some of our modern Hierarchical Champions, bespeaks them better qualify'd to increase the Doubts, and confirm the Prejudices of Unbelievers, than to satisfy

satisfy and remove them. When the Nostrums of a Party are dressed up as the Essentials of Christian Worship, no wonder if Persons of volatile Dispositions should confound Truth and Error, and reject Christianity itself as an Imposture.

But are our * restless Adversaries abroad waiting for the Advantages they reap from the Prospect of Confusion at home? Still 'tis your Lordship's and the Clergy's Business to disappoint their Hopes. Have we Confusions at home? Remove the *Cause*, the *Effect* will cease of course. Who more likely to propagate Confusion, than they who raise a *tumultuous* Alarm of the *Danger of the Church*? Who would establish a Prelatical Jurisdiction on a *level with the civil Constitution itself*, and consequently represent the Church, as invested with a Power to destroy, as well as save; to excommunicate Princes, as well as pardon and absolve them? Instead of this, exert your Influence, my Lord, to heal Strife, and unite Protestants: Put an end to the uncharitable Differences among them, recommend Principles of Love and Benevolence, not to a *distinguishing Sect* or Party, but to the whole Race of Mankind; cultivate a Spirit of Meekness and Charity towards Christians of different Sentiments and Denominations; resign all authoritative Claims over Conscience, and let the Clergy cease from invading the Rights of their Fellow-Creatures, and the sole Prerogative of the Deity; give up the rigid Imposition of things confessedly indifferent in their own Nature, and make the Gates of the Church as wide as the Gates of Heaven.

In Page 8, your Lordship observes, that "we live in an incredulous Age, that much indulges Scepticism, and disputes the Grounds of Faith that have been all along received," Asserting the Right of *private Judgment*, and denying the

* Charge 1. p. 6.

Infallibility of the Church, may perhaps be represented as *Incredulity* by your Lordship. But waving that, let an honest Reverence be paid to Notions that have been received; yet I hope your Lordship's Faith is not settled merely upon Tradition. — Let that be the boasted unenvied Claim of a *corrupt Hierarchy* and *Priestcraft*; but all good Protestants will build their Faith upon a nobler Foundation. *Scepticism* can never prove as injurious to Christianity; what it may to the Church, you are best able to determine; as *Credulity* and an *implicit Obedience*. Enquiring into the Grounds of Faith can't weaken, but confirm and establish its Authority. — I agree that we ought to be always ready, and I add able, to give an Answer to every one that asks a Reason of the Hope that is in us. “ We ought to be prepared to evince the Grounds “ and Necessity of reforming the Church of Eng- “ land, from the Idolatries, Superstitions, and U- “ surpations of the *Romish* Communion.” But ought we not, my Lord, in this to be consistent with ourselves? Or of what avail to deliver an elaborate *Charge against Popery*, and at the same time be for establishing a *Protestant Popery* at home? To dethrone his *Holiness*, and set up in his room an *Infallibility* of your own at *Litchfield* or *Lambeth*, to defend our *Church* upon the Authority of those very Principles you explode as to the *Romish Church* and Communion? — Put the Case, out of Respect to your Lordship, I'll not urge it as Fact, that when you had condemned Bowings and Prostrations to Saints, Incense before, and Salutations to their Images*, the grave Pastoral Charge being concluded, you (very consistently, my Lord) tack'd about, and made a *right Reverend Bow* to the Altar. It will perhaps be said, 'tis out of *Gratitude*, an acknowledgment of Favours, and a *Tri-
bute*

* Charge 2. p. 9.

bute paid for the Gold received from the Altar. But still would not your Lordship's Conduct in such a Case destroy all the Force of your Reasonings? Spectators will conclude that you harangue for *Pay*, but act upon *Principle*. — I remember what I once heard from your Lordship, "*Speculative Notions* are lost upon the Generality of Mankind, but *Example* has its *Influence* on the meanest Capacity."

The next Particular that deserves Notice, is your Observation *, "that we ought to have just Apprehensions of the Judgments of God upon us, in removing our Candlestick, for our most shameful Abuses of the Light of the Gospel, and our preferring the Return of Heathenism both in Principle and Practice to a Divine Revelation." I would hope your Lordship doth not mean this of the Clergy, to whom your Charge is particularly directed. If this Representation be Matter of Fact, I am sorry for it, my Lord: With all Reverence to your sacred Character, I would willingly believe that in this *one Instance 'tis possible* for you to be mistaken. But if you shall insist upon it, I must submit to your Lordship's superior Judgment. However, if so, I find according to your Concession, that the Priesthood are not so zealous in guarding against the Return of Heathenism, as against the loss of spiritual Tithes and Jurisdiction.

'Tis obvious, that the Cry of Judgments, by an unseasonable Application, have lost much of their Force and Terror, and have been generally wrested to serve alike on both sides of a Question. *Zuinglius*, a famous Reformer, being burnt for Heresy, 'twas reported his Heart was found entire and unconsum'd among the Ashes. The Papists urged that it denoted the Hardness and Obduracy of his Heart; the Protestants with *equal Propriety*, that
is,

* Charge 1. p. 9.

is, none at all, represented it as a Sign of its Firmness and Integrity. — In Days of Yore it was believed, that the Entrails of Beasts prophesied; and Birds chattered Futurity: and is it not equally miraculous, that Judgments should arise out of the Dust, and that Dreams or Broomsticks should prognosticate the Displeasure of Heaven? But, my Lord, if Judgments must take place; of *all Judgments*, 'tis the *greatest* to be deluded by such *idle* and *superstitious* Notions, to indulge such *wild* and *visionary* Fears.

What next offers to view, is your Lordship's high Encomiums on the *established Episcopal Church*, where you observe that it *stands * on a level with the civil Constitution itself. Only on a Level*, my Lord? A kind and gracious Concession! The *Church* and King, as your *Lordship well knows*, has been the *Toast of Orthodoxy* for some Ages. The *Mitre* bore the Preheminence, and the *Crown truckled* to its Dictates. But *Tempora mutantur & nos mutamur in illis*.

It is well known, how King *Henry the Second* was excommunicated by the Pope, for affronting a mean-born, saucy, seditious, and ungrateful Priest; who, by his Prince's Favour, had been promoted to the highest Dignities in the Kingdom. Nor did the Vengeance of the Church cease with the Rebel's Death. The Priest-ridden Monarch was obliged to atone for his former want of Docility and Submission to the holy See. Before he would procure an Absolution, he was sentenced to walk barefoot to the infamous Rebel, *Tho. a Becket's Tomb*, and there was whipt and scourg'd by a *Gang of Monks and Villains*, of the Order of *St. Augustine*. And in latter Days we have not wanted Instances of Ecclesiasticks that have pretended to a kind of Sovereignty over Princes. The holy Martyr *Laud* ordered

* Charge 1. p. 10.

dered that the *Queen of Bohemia*, our *present Sovereign's* royal Great Grandmother, and her royal Issue, should have their Names expunged out of the Prayers of the Church, which was accordingly done. Yet when the Church thus triumphed over the civil Constitution, that compleat Churchman *Echard* assures us, that all this time *England* had a mighty shew of Glory and Felicity ! Tho' there were such open and undisguised Attacks upon the Protestant Religion, yet the Church was then so far from Danger, that the same *Reverend Historian* adds it was shining in Grandeur ! But alas ! these happy Days are over ! According to your Lordship's Scheme, it can never go well with the Church, unless its Friends are not only allowed to reign over Conscience, but like *true Sons* of the *Mother of Harlots*, to * reign over the Kings of the Earth. However, this Point deserves a closer Attention. Whence is it, that the Church is on a level with the civil Constitution itself ? Doth it not derive all its Authority from thence ? Is it not the *Great Seal of England* that makes Bishops ? Are the Clergy Subjects, or are they Kings ? Perhaps it will be said, neither ; they are *Gods*, tho' they not only *die*, but *live too*, like other Men. Are they all bound by their *Oaths*, I'll not press their Inclinations into the Service, to be governed by the Laws ? to be governed by them as Subjects ? — But if they are on a *level with the civil Constitution itself*, should any Competition arise, are we bound to obey the Prince and the Laws, or the Church and Clergy ? Or has the Convocation any Right to meet and assemble without the Royal Licence and Authority ? Surely it has, if it be on a *Level with the civil Constitution itself* ? Why then will you, my Lord, and the Dignitaries of the Church submit in so plain a Case to any bold and arbitrary Encroachments

* Revelations.

ments on your Rights, as to suffer yourselves to be prorogued by a *Pretence to Royal Authority*, where there is no just Authority at all? But your Lordship may be able to assign wise Reasons for it. However, on all *proper Occasions*, the Priesthood are to “ * vindicate those spiritual Powers deriv’d from “ their great Master.” Who he is, your Lordship has not thought proper to mention; but I hope, my Lord, you mean neither the *Pope*, nor his elder Brother the Devil. They are to “ vindicate “ those Powers so derived, by shewing that they are “ † in their own Nature *distinct from*, and *inde-* “ *pendent of* all *secular Authority*.” But how is this to be done? — By Mobbing, Treason and Rebellion? Tho’ the fervent Prayers of a righteous Man avail much, yet ’tis to be hoped that neither the fervent Prayers nor Exhortations, even of a Bishop, will ever avail to put in execution any seditious Schemes to render the Church independent of the State, and investing the Priesthood with Authority to depose Emperors and Princes. — But my Lord, however, Men of ‡ *distinguishing Character* buoy themselves up with a Notion of Independence upon civil Government, in *point of Prudence* they should take heed that they do not provoke to Jealousy, that royal Clemency which *connives* at such arrogating Claims and Usurpations. Perhaps it will be said, these are visionary Fears, — for none are blessed with the perusal of the Writings that propagate such Notions, but a few Diocesan Clergy; and that some modern *Episcopal Charges*, the very reverse of their *Authors*, — never reside at Court, but in the Country. However, my Lord, while such fanatical Principles are publicly espoused and defended, you must expect to be called upon to give some consistent Account of your Conduct. When your Lordship had the *Holy Ghost* conferred upon

* Charge 2. p. 53.

† Ibid.

‡ Charge 2. p. 54.

upon you in Ordination, did you not then solemnly subscribe the 37th Article of the Church, which runs thus. — “ The Queen’s Majesty has the
 “ chief Power in this Realm of *England*, and other
 “ her Dominions, unto the chief Government
 “ of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be
 “ ecclesiastical or civil, in all Causes doth appertain ; and is not, nor ought to be subject to any
 “ foreign Jurisdiction.” Have you not solemnly subscribed this Article, my Lord ? — But perhaps you subscribed it as an Article of *Peace*, and not of *Faith*. — Further, is it not expressly ordained by the Canons of our Church, — “ That whosoever shall
 “ hereafter affirm, that the King’s Majesty has not
 “ the same Authority in Causes ecclesiastical, that
 “ the godly Kings had among the *Jews* and Christian Emperors in the Primitive Church, or *impeach any part of his regal Supremacy*, in the said
 “ Causes restored to the Crown, and by the Laws
 “ of this Realm therein established ; let him be
 “ *excommunicate ipso facto*, and not restored but by
 “ the Archbishop, and after his Repentance, and
 “ public Revocation of those his wicked Errors.” And are not all who are consecrated for the Services of the Altar, enjoin’d by Canon 36, to subscribe, “ That the King’s Majesty, under God, is
 “ the only supreme Governor of this Realm, and
 “ of all other his Highness’s Dominions and Countries, as well in all *Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Things or Causes*, as Temporal ; and that no foreign Prince, Person, *Prelate*, State or Potentate, hath, or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, Preheminence or Authority, Ecclesiastical or Spiritual, within his Majesty’s said Realms, Dominions, and Countries.” And according to the 25 *H.* 8. c. 19, “ the Clergy of the Realm
 “ of *England* have not only acknowledged, according to the Truth, that the Convocations of the
 “ same Clergy is, always hath been, and ought to

“ be assembled only by the King’s Writ ; but also
 “ submitting themselves to the King’s Majesty,
 “ have promised, in *verbo Sacerdotis*, that they will
 “ never from henceforth presume to attempt, al-
 “ ledge, claim, or put in Ure, enact, promulge,
 “ or execute any new Canons, Constitutions, Or-
 “ dinances, Provincial, or others ; or by whatso-
 “ ever Name they shall be called in Convocation,
 “ unless the King’s most royal Assent and Licence
 “ to them may be had, to make, promulge, and
 “ execute the same ; and that his Majesty do give
 “ his royal Assent and Authority in that behalf.
 “ And whereas, divers Constitutions, Ordinances,
 “ and Canons, Provincial or Synodal, which here-
 “ tofore have been enacted ; and be thought not
 “ only to be much prejudicial to the King’s Prero-
 “ gative royal, and repugnant to the Laws and
 “ Statutes of this Realm ; but also overmuch one-
 “ rous to his Highness, and his Subjects, &c.”
 And accordingly enacts ; “ Be it therefore enacted,
 “ by the Authority of this present Parliament, ac-
 “ cording to the said Submission and Petition of the
 “ said Clergy, that they, nor either of them hence-
 “ forth, shall *presume* to attempt, alledge, claim,
 “ or put in Ure, any Constitutions, or Ordinan-
 “ ces Provincial or Synodal, or any other Canons,
 “ nor shall enact, promulge, or execute any such Ca-
 “ nons, Constitutions, or Ordinances Provincial, by
 “ whatsoever Name or Names they may be called
 “ in their Convocations in Time coming, which al-
 “ ways shall be assembled by Authority of the
 “ King’s Writ, &c.” And will your Lordship, in
 Defiance of Acts of Parliament, in Contempt of the
 Canons of the Church, and in direct Opposition to
 those Articles you have subscribed, maintain that the
 Church is independent of the Imperial Crown of
 these Realms ?

Your Lordship’s Account of the Opposition to
 the

the Episcopal Church, is, " That * Men's Prejudices are frequently too powerful for their Reason." The Remark in general is certainly just ; and I humbly submit it to the Judgment of the Reader, whether it won't appear from the following Reflections, that your particular preposterous Application of it to others, doth not speak it in Fact the Case of your Lordship. Few, my Lord, are prejudiced in favour of Disgrace, Discouragements, and unpopular Notions. Had the Enemies of the Church any Prospect that their Opposition would entitle them to *Bishopricks, Translations, Pluralities, and Commendams* ; Were there any *Stipends* and *Honours* annexed to their Opposition ; or were their Notions the Offspring of *Churchmanship* and *Brandy*, none at all would be surpris'd that their Prejudices should be too powerful for their Reason. But when Men expose themselves to great Hardships and Difficulties in Life, to a low and penurious Subsistence, when they prefer Poverty and a good Conscience to Wealth and Power, 'tis unaccountable it should be suggested, that under such Circumstances, Prejudices are too powerful for their Reason. Did they thirst after universal Hierarchy, and grasp at Empire in *this World*, as well as lay claim to the *Keys of the next* ; their Prejudices in supporting such *interested Views*, might prove too powerful for their Reason. — But when we consider, my Lord, that the Party in the Opposition are generally made up of *conscientious illiterate Folks*, that wear *meagre* and *sanctify'd* Complexions, and don't court *Grandeur* and *Popularity* as much as *Grace* and *Truth*, which came by *Christ Jesus* ; where is the Charity, where is the Consistence ; nay, where is the *Prudence*, which may be a more *fundamental* Point with your Lordship, to damn them wholesale as a Race of prejudiced Bigots ? Was *your Lordship* to renounce all ecclesiastical Immunities

and Honours, to resign your Church-Preferments, cease from lording it in the Senate, and with an awful Brow adjusting the weighty Concerns of the Nation ; were you to desire to be a Bishop, as it is a *good Work*, rather than covet a Bishoprick without any of the Work at all, as it is a *good fat thing* ; some perhaps would then be convinc'd, that *you were prejudiced* against the Love of Money, but none would ever suggest that your Lordship, in such a Case, was prejudiced against the Force of Conviction.

Indeed, such a fatal Bias do worldly Pomp and Greatness put upon Men's Understandings, that our Saviour seems to represent it impossible, that those who enjoy them, should at the same time be sincere Admirers of Truth. How can they believe, who receive Honour one of another ? The Emoluments of the Church, its consecrated Treasures and Trinkets would have been in Danger, clerical Authority and Power must cease, if Christianity took place; and rather than renounce these, it seems, like *good Churchmen*, they would have sworn Religion to be a Bubble, as well as the *Messiah* to be an Impostor.

I would not suppress any thing, that may give *Pleasure* to your Lordship. Among many other surprizing Miracles recorded in sacred History, one almost *incredible* in its nature, is, — That a *great number* of Priests became *obedient to the Faith*. Perhaps, my Lord, you may not think the Miracle so great as I represent it ; but I shall have your Lordship's Concurrence when you consider, that they became obedient with a View to Glory and Immortality, and not to *present Pay*. Upon the whole, it appears that when Men embrace despised unfashionable Notions, 'tis more natural to suppose, that Reason triumphs over their Interests and their Prejudices, than that Interest truckles to Prejudice, and Prejudice triumphs over Reason.

In

In the following Page your Lordship accounts for *Jerome's* Opinion concerning Episcopacy; by observing that *Jerome* entertained some Resentments against *John, Bishop of Jerusalem*, and therefore treated Episcopacy with some Terms of Diminution. Might you not have said, my Lord, without mincing the matter, with an avow'd Contempt? The good Father, it seems, was out of humour, and he must needs publish *solemn Lies* to gratify his Spleen and Passion. As for my part, I take the History of *Quixote's Errandries*, to be a lively Emblem of the wild romantic Extravagancies of the Fathers. Nor am I at all concerned either with *Jerom* or *Episcopacy*. — But where is the Consistence of deifying the *Authority* of the *Fathers*, when they serve a Turn, and of representing them as Persons of no Integrity or Character, if they happen to be against you? Their *Authority* is indisputable, if their Schemes tally with yours; but they must be *old, peevish, passionate, Bigots* or *Hypocrites*, if on the other side of the Question. It put me in mind of the Humour of Country Elections, as running exactly parallel with this Behaviour in your Lordship. The abandon'd Tools of a Party, are painted under the venerable Names of Patriots, whilst Persons of greatest Integrity in different Principles and Interests, are weak, corrupt, crafty, or designing; or to use the Language of Mr. *Addison's* Fox-hunter, which perhaps may be more agreeable to your Lordship *, “ One is a Dog, another is a Whelp, another a Cur, another the “ Son of a Bitch;” under which several Denominations, the rural Squire comprehended all those who were attach'd to an Interest opposite to his own. Whether St. *Jerom* has met with a kinder Fate, is very easy to be determined.

What next occurs, is, that as soon as the Apostles

* Freeholder.

files left the World, the * “*Ordinary Functions*” of their Apostleship devolv’d on the Bishops as “*Governors of particular Churches.*” I am glad to find that the Bishops in those early Days did not arrogate to themselves all the lordly Claims of spiritual Authority. It seems the Province of those who would be the *Governors of the Universe*, and who have been its *Plague*, I don’t mean Protestant Bishops, my Lord, was originally to be Governors of *particular Churches*. But did they as Governors lay claim to a *Monopoly* of Wealth and Grace? Were they the *only wise Men*, and was all Wisdom to die with them? No; it was to be conveyed down in an *uninterrupted Succession*, to the future Priests of future Ages. — But wherein did the *ordinary Function* of Apostleship consist? Was it not in preaching the Word in Season and out of Season? And is this devolved upon the Bishops? I should have rather concluded, that they would be Heirs to the more *extraordinary miraculous Gifts* of the Apostles, and to prove their Title of Inheritance, shew by their Example, that they can *work Miracles* at proper Seasons, as it is a *Miracle* for a — *modern Bishop* to preach.

I shall not examine at present, into what your Lordship has advanced concerning the Importance of studying ecclesiastical Antiquity. That the History of the Fathers is nothing more than a Representation of a *Theological Bear-garden*, is what I presume, my Lord, you’ll readily agree to; and in return to such a Concession, let it be acknowledged, that Men of Leisure may squander away their Time decently and genteely upon them. But,

We are now arriving at another Period; and to view “the † Episcopal Church as established by” Law, when the Powers of the *Roman Empire* became Christian.” I take it for granted that in your Lord-

* Charge 1. p. 13.

† Charge 1. p. 17.

Lordship's Phrase, the *Episcopal Church* and *Christianity* always go for synonymous Expressions. You observe, that before Christianity was established, " * it was in an unhappy State of Minority." But whether the Church when its *State of Minority* ceas'd, did not like some *other Minors*, when grown up to be their own Masters, distinguish itself more by its *Pride and Possessions*, than by any more valuable Accomplishments, I leave to you to consider ; whether it did not likewise act in open Contempt of the wise and salutary Instructions of its old Guardians and Friends, will perhaps be none of your *Lordship's* Interest to determine. But however unhappy the Church's State of Minority may appear, it must be allowed, my Lord, to be more unhappy still, if such times should ever happen, when the Name of the *Church* shall be made an Engine of *Tyranny and Superstition*; when its Authority shall be urged to oppress Honesty and Conscience ; when such Notions are advanced, as that God Almighty is only the Deputy of Ecclesiastics, and can confer Grace and Favour only with the leave of the sacred Priesthood, and by the Permissioun of my Lords the Bishops ; and when those monopolize to themselves the Salvation of another World, who are scarce worthy to live in this. Nor can our Fears of such times be ill grounded, if what your Lordship maintains be true, " that there is scarce " Honesty enough in the Nation to preserve it from " downright ruin." *Persecution* was never so fatal to Christianity, as the *Domineering Claims* of High Churchmen. Nothing has fix'd a greater Odium upon Religion, than crafty and designing^d Bigots, *tacking the Interest of Heaven* to those extravagant Fooleries that support *their own*. But I ask pardon, notwithstanding all your Zeal for a Hierarchy
and

* Ibid.

and * *Terriers*, I am far from judging your Lordship to be of that Number.

'Tis granted that there ought to be † a proper Maintenance for the Clergy. — But what will your Lordship judge to be proper on such an Occasion? Must they have that Reward for *worshipping God*, which was offered our Saviour for *worshipping the Devil*, the *Kingdoms* of this World, and *all the Glories* thereof. Must their Hire be proportionate to the Work and Merit, or must the Lazy, the Indolent, and Unskilful have all the Pay, though they do nothing to earn it? My Lord, were Church Emoluments distributed in just and equitable Proportions, there would be a handsome and liberal Subsistence for every Parish Priest in the Nation. I appeal to your Lordship as to this. 'Tis a trite Observation, “ That the Church had “ *golden Priests*, when it had *wooden Chalice*s; “ but when Religion brought forth Wealth, the “ *Daughter devoured the Mother*.” Yet notwithstanding this, your Lordship well knows that this unnatural Monster which preys upon that which gave her Birth, has a Multitude of *rival Admirers*, and is courted if not *idoliz'd* by the whole Body of the Priesthood. 'Tis true; many of that venerable Herd are under strait Circumstances: Let them be relieved out of the Abundance of those who neither *want nor deserve* it. There is something very entertaining in *Constantine's* well-meant Folly and Devotion to the Clergy, when assembled at the Council of *Nice*: “ God has made you Priests, and has “ impower'd you to judge me righteously, but “ you are above the Cognizance of any human “ Tribunal. — You are as Gods to me, and no “ Man has Authority to judge you.” My Lord, I often thought that *Consecration* was one of the Church's peculiar Prerogatives and Blessings; but
it

* See Charge 1. p. 37.

† Charge 1. p. 18.

it seems to be otherwise in this Instance, and many of the holy Tribe have arrogated Divinity ever since *.

The Authority of the *Theodosian* Code is urged by your Lordship in favour of Establishments, I won't say with a view to supersede the Authority of the Bible. It has been condemned as Idolatry †, and exaggerated in the blackest Views, to believe that the Will of the Son is dependent upon that of the Father ; but it is an *orthodox* Principle to believe that the Will of God should submit to, and be determined by human Laws and Systems. Supposing a Subordination of Persons in the Godhead, has been marked out as an Instance of accomplished Wickedness and Folly ; but to represent the Christian Revelation as subordinate to the Authority of the Church, is no Crime at all ; nay, the greatest of all *Ecclesiastical*, I cannot say *Christian* Virtues. And even to *depose* the Father, is less unpardonable than to deny the *Supremacy of the Clergy*. But whatever your Lordship may think, I must own myself too much an *Infidel*, to believe against the first Principles of Reason. Your Lordship wishes that *Julian's* Malice towards the Clergy had found none to imitate it out of Hatred to Christianity itself. Then 'tis granted, that his Malice was not levied at *Christianity*, but at *Ecclesiastics*. I rejoice to find it allow'd that there may be an Enmity against the ill Conduct of the latter, without any Disregard to the former. But perhaps, upon farther Consideration, your Lordship may think proper to retract this.

You observe, that “ such ‡ an extraordinary sort
“ of Subsistence as that, by voluntary Contribu-
“ tions is not always to be expected ; and a legal Es-
“ tablishment doth justly compensate for the want
E “ of

* Charge 1. p. 18.
on Arianism.

† See Dr. *Smallbrook's* Sermons
‡ Charge 1. p. 19.

“ of Oblation, when the Love of many is grown
 “ very cold.” But why are not voluntary Contributions always to be expected? — The Clergy, as Men of Character and Education, will always engage Reverence and Esteem, if they have Prudence and good Conduct enough to deserve it. I am inform’d, that the Protestant Dissenting Ministers here in *England*, receive their Pay by voluntary Contributions; and if I am rightly instructed, ’tis the same with some of the reformed Protestants abroad. Will your Lordship pretend that the Preachers in the Establishment don’t do as much to recommend themselves to their People’s Affections, as those to theirs? Are not those who frequent Places of establish’d Worship, much more considerable in Numbers, than those who attend separate Congregations? If so, then the Dissenting Clergy must be Men of superior Worth, or the Dissenters in general must be Persons of a more beneficent Disposition than those who submit to established Rites and Impositions. — I can’t admit of either; however, I’ll not dispute this Point with your Lordship.

Is the Love of many grown *cold*? What can be the Reason? Is Bigotry *warm* and *rampant*? Are the Laity *shackled* with Creeds and Impositions? — No wonder, if so, that their Love is grown *very cold*! ’Tis well if the very Fundamentals of Christianity be not banish’d from amongst them. Or doth it proceed from the want of better Instructions? Do the Clergy *live* upon the *Ignorance* and *Superstition* of the People, without any regard to the Duties of their Function? *Hot Sermons*, my Lord, have been generally productive of suitable Effects, *Bloodshed*, *Rancour*, and *Confusion*. How far *cold* and *lifeless* ones, without any Force of Address, or Energy of Reason, may propagate *Coldness*, is well worth our Attention.

In

In the next Paragraph it follows, “ that Establishments don’t convert spiritual into civil, but “ give a Sanction to that which was before, and “ still continues divine and heavenly.” That is, tho’ Priests are above being engaged in any thing that bears the Name of a secular Employment, yet to shew the World their *Humility*, they condescend to accept the highest secular Dignities and Honours. But is every thing *divine* and *heavenly* in the established Constitution? All the Claims of the Hierarchy *divine* and *heavenly*, my Lord? Tho’ Branches of spiritual Dominion which are an Oppression upon Mankind, and a Reproach to Christianity, *divine* and *heavenly* in their Nature? Have you not expressly declared, that there are some lesser Deficiencies in the Government of the Church, and are these *divine* and *heavenly* too? — They are legal Privileges. — True, so was once the Act *de Hæretico comburendo*, and no doubt would be counted so still, had not the Wisdom of the Legislature, to restrain Priestly Vengeance and Executions, thought proper to repeal it.

But I must beg leave to expostulate with your Lordship on another Subject. What Connexion between Virtue and Establishments, my Lord? Do Establishments, merely because they are so, demand our Reverence and Esteem? ’Tis to be hoped then, your Lordship will exert your Influence, that we may have *establish’d Gods* as well as an *establish’d Religion*; and that we may be blessed with *national Divinities*, as well as *national Churches*, and let all those who expect any Church-Promotions, *swear Allegiance*, if not to the King, yet at least to the Gods of their Country. However romantic to Infidels this Scheme may appear, however unfriendly to Christianity, it will be for the good of the Church, increate its Wealth and Power, and the lowest Rank of ecclesiastical Officers, who are now

no more than the *Privy Counsellors* of Heaven, will then be privileged to *make*, as well as *set forth* strange Gods. If Establishments are such glorious Things, why are not Good-nature, social Virtue, and free Enquiry into Truth, established by parliamentary Power? Without this let none arrogate to themselves the Names of Establishments *of Religion*! — If our Establishment comprehends all this, why so many Whores and Cut-throats, so many ignorant Bigots, Knaves, and Persecutors in our Church and Communion? Why so many *Tyburn Saints* and *Confessors*, that die in the Faith of our Church? I leave you to account for this, and should rejoice to find that Establishments have a greater Tendency to propagate Virtue, than to debauch Men's Morals and Understandings; and to promote Pride, Avarice and Faction.

Your Lordship observes, that the * “ *Roman* “ Emperors were invested with Power of govern- “ ing the Church as well as the State.” What, my Lord, *Lay-Governors* of Churches? And yet the Church on a *level with the civil Constitution itself*, to whose Government she submits? If the *Roman* Emperors were invested with a Power of Church Government, how comes this to be now *peculiarly appropriated* to Priests and Bishops? But I stand corrected, my Lord. They were only invested with an *usurped* Power of governing the Church, the *sole uncontrollable Right* of Government lies in the Clergy.

’Tis worth remarking, that insisting on the Rights of Conscience, seems to give great Umbrage and Offence to your Lordship. The divine Right of Church-Lands and Episcopacy, of Tithes and Offerings, I presume never give any Umbrage at all. But to urge the Rights of Conscience in your Phrase, “ *is invidious*.” I should not have been surprized

* Charge 1. p. 20.

prized to find one that is a Stranger to the Laws of Conscience himself, represent all Regards for its Dictates in others, as mere *Entbusiasm*, Rant and Folly. But to find a *Church of England* Divine, a *Dignitary* in the *Church*, decrying Conscience with so much Contempt, and with a *solemn Sneer* paint out those who are influenced by it, as * “high Pre-
 “tenders to spiritual Liberty,” must be a Paradox to all that are not as well initiated in those *bold Mysteries* as your *Lordship*. Speak out, my Lord.
 — Tell the World that Conscience is only a *Trick of Priests*, an *ecclesiastical Foot-ball*, to be tossed about just as it *serves the Times*. Generously declare, that ’tis *invidious* to urge Conscience against — *some Thousands* a Year, that whatever strikes at Church-Tyranny is *invidious*, or whatever weakens the Foundations of all illegal and arbitrary Encroachments upon the Rights of Mankind.

The next Observation carries along with it, something very extraordinary in its Nature. As to “the Reformation of the Idolatrous *Jews*, or the
 “abolishing of Paganism, and Establishment of
 “Christianity, and the ecclesiastical Constitution,
 “by the respective *Jewish* and Christian Princes †;
 “in fact, their assumed Supremacy was an *Usurpa-*
 “tion on Men’s natural Rights.” That is, according to your Lordship, the *Jewish* Reformers, and Christian Princes, were accomplished Villains. But, my Lord, were not the *Jews* under a State of Theocracy? Was not God himself the immediate Ruler and Governor of that People? If Idolatry was severely punish’d amongst them; when fallible Men are on a Level with the Deity, as to Knowledge, Wisdom, and Goodness, then, and not before, let them go and do likewise. — I shall therefore confine myself to an Examination of the Account you have given as to Christian Princes. Were they

* Charge 1. p. 21.

† Ibid.

they in Fact guilty of *usurping* Men's natural Rights? Did they *persecute* and *punish* all who could not fall in with the ecclesiastical Constitution? Did they *curse* and *excommunicate* those who *disclaimed* all Pretensions to Infallibility? Did they inflict *Pecuniary Mulcts*, and encourage oppressive Laws? I no longer wonder that your Lordship is inspired with such a warm Zeal for Establishments. And are the high flown Pretensions of the Hierarchy, in being on a *level with the civil Constitution*, founded upon *Fraud* and *Usurpation*? Your Church-Dignities and Revenues nothing but an *Usurpation* upon the Rights and Properties of Subjects? Is your *Pay*, (for your Prayers are an unknown Blessing,) an *establish'd Usurpation*, and *Establishments* in general, the Offspring of Craft and Delusion? Truth will out, my Lord. But I should have been better pleased with this from an Infidel or a Fanatic's Pen than from your Lordship's.

I have nothing to object to this honest Account given of Establishments. But, my Lord, must we place in the same View all our Church-Reformers? Were this true, a Religion supported by such *iniquitous* Measures may justly *complain of Danger*! Hail ye glorious Reformers of Mankind, from Idolatries and Superstition, from a Spirit of Bondage and Darkness, ye Heaven-born Patriarchs of Liberty, awake your venerable Ashes, and hear yourselves *branded* with the Character of *Usurpers*! Behold your Names prostituted to give sanction to the Bigotry of *weak Rulers*, that have been first deluded, and then destroy'd by *imperious wicked Ecclesiastics*!

But it seems tho' the reforming Princes were guilty of an Usurpation on Mens natural Rights in settling Establishments, yet * " their Subjects,
" notwithstanding any *pretended Scruples* and *Rights*
" of

* Charge 1. p. 21.

“ of *Conscience*, were obliged to comply with those
 “ established Reformations, when they were not
 “ sinful in themselves, nor contrary to the Laws
 “ of God.” Then it seems, my Lord, *Usurpations*
 of natural Rights, are neither *sinful* in themselves,
 nor *repugnant* to divine Precepts. The *Church*
 changes the nature of things, converts *Villany* into
holy Zeal, and *unchristian Usurpations* are made the
 Bulwarks of the *Christian Religion*. But admitting
 Usurpations of Men’s Rights, to be as innocent as
 you apprehend them, (tho’ I am satisfy’d you’ll not
 allow any Usurpations on your *Lordship’s* or the
Church’s Rights to be of that Number) who is to
 judge whether they are to be submitted to? Have
 we recourse to any infallible Judicature, or is every
 Man to judge for himself? — It seems, not the
 latter; for notwithstanding “ any Scruples and
 “ pretended Rights of Conscience, Men are
 “ obliged to comply with such Establishments and
 “ Reformations.” ’Tis allowed, those who fall
 in with your Lordship’s Scheme, would pretend
 no *Scruples*, or urge no *Right of Conscience* to hin-
 der their falling in with *gainful Establishments* and
Reformations. But what if a weak Man of Integri-
 ty can’t satisfy himself in prostituting his Conscience
 to the *Authority* of the Church? If he is oppressed
 with any Doubts which way to chuse instead of
 making *rational Enquiries* into things, has he no-
 thing to do but follow the Advice of a *Reverend Ca-*
suist, *whistle* and *sing*, whilst these *Fits of the Devil*
 are upon him? Or doth the Strength and Glory of
 the Church consist in large Numbers of *Hackney*
Consciences amongst us, that are to be *lett* to the *best*
Bidder?

’Tis true, my Lord, “ the * royal Supremacy
 “ has been frequently recogniz’d by the Legisla-
 “ ture, and accordingly sworn to by liege Sub-
 “ jects,

* Charge 1. p. 21.

“jects,” and by the *Clergy too*, “on all proper Occasions ;” tho’ with what Congruity, your Lordship can best tell, if the Church be *on a level with the civil Constitution itself, and independent of it*. Perhaps they put the same Construction upon *Oaths* as others do upon their *Prayers*, and imagine few will take them to be in earnest. I don’t represent this as the Case of all the Sons of the Church. But as to those who swear to the *Supremacy of the Crown*, and yet maintain that the Church is *on a level with the civil Constitution* ; I publicly call upon and challenge your Lordship to give a more favourable Account of their Conduct.

The Question, with relation to Uniformity of Worship, is not whether we are oblig’d to * submit to the Royal Supremacy, and the Laws of the Land, in all matters that are not repugnant to the Laws of God ; but whether we must cowardly submit to the Authority of Churchmen, when repugnant to the royal Supremacy, the Laws of God, and the Laws of the Land all together ? Whether we are in Duty bound to *bow down and worship our Sovereign Lords the Clergy* ? — Whether the *Word of God*, or *Catholick Antiquity* is to be the Rule of our Faith and Conduct ? Whether there can be any *lawful Authority*, any *Authority* derived from the *New Testament*, or the *Reason of things*, to impose things that are in their own nature *confessedly indifferent*, as *necessary and essential* Terms of Christian Communion ? Has the Church any Right to *exclude* those from its Ordinances whom God will at last *admit* to his Kingdom ? Whatever Sect pretends to this, let it be called a *Party-Club*, a *caballing, intriguing, spiritual Faction*, but let it not be called the Church of Christ, which is as opposite to it, as Light is to Darkness.

In the following Pages, your Lordship expatiates
on

* Charge i. p. 23.

on the Excellency of the Liturgy and Government of our Church. But are there no *Blemishes* in either? Would it not have been generous to have pointed these to your Clergy, my Lord? Would it not have discovered greater Impartiality to confess that the Church is fallible; to reject the *obscure, unintelligible* Notions of bungling Creed-makers; and allow the Bible exclusive of all *Priestly Appendages* and *supplemental Decorations*, to be a perfect Rule of our Faith and Manners? Indeed, your Lordship has hinted that the *superior Authority* of God, is rather to be obeyed than that of Men. That is, I presume, if it happens to coincide with the Authority of the Church. But, my Lord, such Hints, in *point of Prudence*, ought to be cautiously given. In the Language of our Church, they are of dangerous Consequence; and have led Men to *apostatize* into the Truth.

I must not pass by what your Lordship asserts *,
 “ that the Rights of Conscience do by no means in-
 “ terfere either with the Establishment of an ec-
 “ clesiastical Constitution in general, or with the
 “ present Establishment of the Church of *England*
 “ in particular.” I won’t charge *your Lordship*
 with Absurdity and Contradiction. *Mystery* is a
 more polite and fashionable Term. Permit me
 then to observe, that ’tis a *Mystery with a vengeance*,
 how to reconcile this with what you advanced
 elsewhere, † that “ in fact the assumed Supre-
 “ macy of Christian Powers was an Usurpation on
 “ Mens natural Rights.” Holy, infallible and
 omnipotent Mother! By virtue of thy Authority,
 the reform’d Religion is damn’d, as an Usurpation
 of natural Rights; and by virtue of the same, to
 serve a different Turn, no Establishments whatso-
 ever clash with the Rights of Conscience, whether
 it be the Establishment of the Alcoran, of an In-
 F qui-

* p. 27. Charge 1.

† Charge 1. p. 21.

quifition, of the Church of *England*, of *Scotland*, or *Geneva*! “ If Men are perfwaded that what is “ *eftabliſh’d* is unlawful, they muſt *patiently ſuffer*.” By parity of Reason, if Men of *Importance* utter Inconſiſtencies, others muſt patiently ſubmit to hear them. But, my Lord, as you are a ſkilful Caſuiſt, — I would be reſolv’d in this; *Job* had *Patience* enough to bear the Perſecutions of the *De-vil*, and as ſome have thought, *worſt* of all Devils, the Devil of a Wife. — But as I can’t embrace that Notion, I would be informed, would his *Patience* have maintained Ground againſt the Perſecutions of Nonsense? Is not his expoſtulatory Addreſs to his Friends juſtly applicable to all the Patrons of *publick Conſcience*, of a cruel oppreſſive Spirit? *Will ye ſpeak wickedly for God? Will ye talk deceit-fully for him?* — If Men muſt patiently ſuffer under Eſtabliſhments which they are perſuaded to be unlawful, how will your Lordſhip, upon this footing, vindicate the Conduct of our firſt Reformers from Popery, who inſtead of *patiently ſuffering*, thought it their Duty to hazard their Lives and Fortunes for the effectual Accompliſhment of a Reformation? I have been puzzling myſelf, *Ari-ſtole*, *Scotus*, and *Aquinas*, in hopes of hammering out ſome Diſtinction that might, in this Caſe, have ſerv’d for an *Evaſion*; but all without Succeſs, and therefore muſt leave it to your Lordſhip.

’Tis agreed, that when thoſe who diſſent from us, are legally indulg’d a Liberty of Conſcience*, “ they ought to *thank God* for it;” and I add, *not the Clergy*. But what Diſturbance can it give the Public, for Men to propoſe their Sentiments with Freedom and Honesty, and to attack Craft, Knavery, and Superſtition?

It gives me a ſenſible Pleaſure, to find it allow’d, “ that † *ſecular Authority*, and *advantagious Pla-* “ *ces*,

* Charge 1. p. 27.

† Charge 1. p. 28.

"*ces*, are not things *essential* to Religion." But I suppose, my Lord, you mean no more than that they are not *essential* to it on *both* sides of the Question. As we have a right to *differ* from all Mankind, but none have a Right to *differ* from us; so are not Church-Wealth and Power, things *essential* to Religion amongst us, tho' they bear no manner of Connection with it in other Communities and Churches? — The Reader will observe, what your Lordship has asserted *, that the Fate of the Tithes and Christianity are immediately connected! that is, to render your Lordship consistent, tho' *Tithes* are not *essential* to Christianity, yet Christianity must fall without them. A *Christianity* without *Tithes* would no more relish with the *sacred Priesthood*, than a *Sermon* without *Party-beat*, and *uncharitable Language*, low, and *unmannerly Invektive*. But supposing it Fact, that worldly Greatness is not essential to Religion; *Bishops*, my Lord, must be brought down on a *level* with *other Men*, and without any Danger to the Church, *Christianity* may be rescued from the *scandalous Abuse* of one of its most solemn Institutions. — But it is observed, that "the Rights of Kings and the Legislature, "are a just Ballance to the *supposed* Rights of "Conscience of private Subjects;" a notable Defence of all the Craft, Villanies, and inquisitorial Vengeance of *Romish* Priests and Prelates!

The Rights of Conscience, as to private Subjects, are *supposed Rights*, that is *pretended Rights*, without any Foundation to support the Claim, or in other words, *none* have a *Right* to think, who don't think, I will not say according to the Direction of the Legislature; but according to the Direction of my L—ds the B——ps. But 'tis further alledg'd, "that when rightly explain'd, the Rights of the "Legislature and private Subjects, don't interfere "with one another." If so, when one was fixed

* Charge 1. p. 42.

on "as a just Ballance to the other," of consequence you have not rightly explained them. But I desist, lest it should be judg'd *Scan. Magn.* to dispute the Unerringness of your Lordship's Judgment.

'Tis urged, that in the * Circumstances of divine Worship, and all indifferent matters, the *Authority of the Legislature* ought surely to prevail over *private Opinions*? What if *private Opinions* are agreeable to *Reason* and a *divine Revelation*, ought *Authority* to prevail over *Truth*, and *Tyranny* over *Conscience*? — By Circumstances of Worship and indifferent Matters, 'tis presumed you understand, things not *essential* to our future Happiness. I must once more call upon you, my Lord, to vindicate, upon this Footing, the Justice and Equitableness of our Reformation from Popery. No Men of Candour will assert an impossibility of Salvation in the *Romish Church* and Communion. How then, according to your Reasoning, can you account for renouncing the *Catholic Faith*? But with whom ought *Authority* to prevail over *private Opinions*? Not with *honest Men*, and give me leave to add, I hope without Offence, not with *your Lordship*. With Persons of Integrity and Judgment, no *Authority* will have any weight, but *that of Reason*. *Authority* has been urged with equal Zeal on very different Occasions. *Authority* for *Arianism*, as strong *Authority* against it. And must our *Principles* change as *Authority* changes Sides? Then we no longer worship God, but the Times. — We have the *Authority* of *Fathers* against *Fathers*, *Councils* against *Councils*, and *Bishops* against *Bishops*. *Authority* has often consecrated Error, nurs'd Ignorance, and suppressed Truth. *Authority* has made *Tyrants*, *Authority* has made *Slaves*, *Authority* has made *Hypocrites*, *Authority* has made *Creeeds*, *Churches*,

ches, and *Gods*; but mere *Authority* has seldom propagated *Virtue*, or true *Religion*. Is the *Legislature* infallible, that we should make it our *Standard*, and submit our *Judgments* to its *Direction*? No, that is the sole *Prerogative*, not of unhallowed *Laics*, but of the *Church* and *Bishops*! Why then must we recognize *public* and *establish'd* *Opinions*? It can't be always out of deference to *Truth*. I presume then, my *Lord*, it must be for the same *Reason*, as a *late eminent Divine* was induced to serve *God* towards the *East*: He that will be a *rising Man*, let him worship the *rising Sun*. The *Design* of civil *Laws* is not to settle *Orthodoxy*, but to punish *Immoralities*, that bear an ill *Aspect* on the *Welfare* of a *Nation*. Neither *Virtue* nor *Knowledge* are the *Offspring* of *Constraint* and *Power*. Were it so, my *Lord*, *Tyburn Officers* would be as great *Benefactors* to *Mankind*, as the *Consecrators* of *Christians* and *Churches*. But 'tis to be feared, that tho' *Crouds* attend both in the *Execution* of their respective *Offices*; yet neither the *Dignity* of *Characters*, nor the *Solemnity* of their *Function*, would transfuse *Knowledge* or *Virtue* into the minds of *Spectators*.

Your *Lordship* apprehends *, that "the *Force* of *Religion* is weaken'd by independent *Schemes* and endless *Divisions*." That is, the liberty of private *Judgment*, which will unavoidably produce, what you call, independent *Schemes* and endless *Divisions*, weakens the force of *Religion*. What an *Odium* doth this cast on the *Reformation*? Upon that glorious and memorable *Æra of British Liberty*, the *Revolution*? And upon the illustrious *Protestant Family* on the *Throne*? All which have confirmed our right of judging for ourselves, of being led by *Reason*, and not by *Priests*; and therefore, according to your *Lordship*, have been accessary towards
weak-

* Charge 1. p. 30.

weakening the Force of Religion? And what follows, if Men are not allowed to think for themselves in matters of Faith and Religion, Tyranny and Ignorance will be represented as the Parents of Virtue, and an *usurping Priesthood* become the only proper Object of such a Devotion! My Lord, you may write *ten thousand* Charges against Popery, declaim against its Errors, and Corruptions, and particularly against * *Rival Bishops*, that escape with Impunity, and yet be far from doing any real Service to the Protestant Cause, whilst these Notions are so warmly advanced, and I dare say *sincerely too*, that strike at the very Fundamentals of the Reformation! But, in *point of Prudence*, to use your Lordship's own Words, whatever your Sentiments may be, you ought, as the Times go, to have suppressed this.

'Tis not likely, that the wise Author of Nature, ever intended that Men should think alike in all speculative Matters, otherwise he might have put all Truth on a *level* with the *meanest* Understandings; or given all Mankind *equal Capacities* for judging. Indeed, Uniformity in religious Principles is not only not to be *expected*; but not to be *wish'd for*, under the present Circumstances of our Nature. Variety of Opinions animate Men with Resolution in making free and vigorous Re-searches into things; they *improve* Knowledge, and *cherish* Instruction. Besides, as in Government one Party is a Check upon another, and a warm Opposition to the Measures of those who are of the greatest Weight and Influence in the Senate, *necessitates* them to maintain a *prudent Jealousy* over themselves, lest they countenance any Transactions that may *justify* the Opposition that is forming against them; and *awaken* the Resentments of a free People. Were it not for such happy Struggles, no Nation would be

* See Charge against Popery, p. 52.

be safe from being *swallowed up* by the *Arbitrariness*, *Avarice*, or *Ambition* of Men of corrupt Disposition. So is it the same as to our *religious* Disputes and Contests. Were it not owing to these, would not *Creeds* and *Establishments* soon triumph over *Sense*, *Honesty*, and *Conscience*? The only Religion in *fashion*, would be on the one side, to *consecrate* Tyranny, and on the other to *worship* Bondage. Where *Free-thinking* has been banish'd from a Country, and *established Standards* of Orthodoxy settled in its room, *Mimickry* has always passed for *Virtue*, and *ridiculous Errantry* for *divine Grace*. Nay, often it has been counted equally *enthusiastic*, to decry *Forms of Godliness*, and *Forms of Prayer*, and *Puppet-show Devotions* have atoned for the want of *rational Worship* and *Obedience*. But it seems, according to your Lordship, to *explode Priestcraft* and *Superstition*, is, to weaken the *Force of Religion*. If *Differences* in Sentiments and Opinions, are so injurious to Christianity, is it not a high Reflection upon the Supreme Being, that he has treated Mankind with *different Intellectuals*, *Features*, *Capacities* and *Endowments*? Is it not a high Reflection on the Wisdom and Goodness of the Deity, that we have an *agreeable variety* of Cattle in our Flocks, of Herbs in our Fields, and Flowers in our Gardens? My Lord, if your Observation holds good, these must be so many *Solecisms in Nature*. As for my own part, I think *too kindly* of my Maker, to countenance such *extravagant Imaginations*. But 'tis neither my *Province* nor *Inclination* to make *Creeds* for your Lordship.

I shall not enter upon the Enquiry, whether the Episcopal part of our Constitution (I presume you mean Diocesan Episcopacy, my Lord) be "as ancient as Christianity itself in this Island." I have sometimes met with Persons who valued themselves upon the Character of *orthodox Churchmen*, as *orthodox*

thodox perhaps, as your *Lordship*, that have asserted our *Book of Common Prayer* to be of much greater Antiquity than the Bible; and I make no question, but they paid it a greater Reverence and Esteem. But, my Lord, as it can't give any Dignity to the *Character of the Devil*, that he was a Murderer from *the beginning*, so any Pleas of Antiquity, admitting them to be Fact, can't justify Error, Tyranny, and Usurpation. — I therefore pass by your Remarks on the Constitution of the Primitive Church, which you have asserted without the Expence of any Proof, since probably they may be as firmly believed when urged by your Lordship, considering your “*distinguishing Character*,” without any Proof at all.

* The *Theodosian* Code is refer'd to, as an Authority to shew that “the ancient Christians believed that a public Contempt of the Christian Religion was punishable by human Laws.” Did Christ and his Apostles believe so, my Lord? Did they teach such Doctrines to their Followers and Disciples, or practise accordingly themselves? Why did not the Author of our holy Faith exert his miraculous Power, command the Sword, Famine, or Pestilence, to rage over the Universe, and destroy all those who would not submit to his Authority, or disputed his Mission? Why did he not depopulate the Earth for the Honour of the God of Heaven? Why did he not punish those *Jewish High-Churchmen* that blasphemed his Religion, by attributing the Miracles he wrought to the Power of Devils? Why did he not countenance his Disciples, when they would have called down Fire from Heaven to consume the heretical *Samaritans*? Nay, why, my Lord, did he not erect Star-Chambers and High-Commission Courts, establish Laws for pecuniary Fines and Imprisonments, assemble

* See Charge 1. p. 31.

semble Synods and Convocations, excommunicate and consign over all those to the Mercy of Ecclesiastics and the Devil, who had Honesty enough to examine into things; and Resolution enough to publish the Result of their Enquiries. — But I'll press this no farther. — 'Tis enough, that he was not advised by your Lordship. — I know it has been urged, that Projectors seldom accomplish their Views, but Posterity reap the sweet Fruits of their Labours. But, my Lord, you'll not approve of any Reflections so injurious to the Character of the *wise benevolent* Author of the Christian Religion.

The next Remark I shall offer, relates to what you observe *, that Nonconformists “ profess a “ *Form of the Christian Religion.*” I agree, that in *point of Prudence* we ought to reverence moderate Conformity to the Humours of the Church and Women. But is there nothing but a *Form* of Religion amongst those who think otherwise, my Lord? Do Honesty and Virtue degenerate into *meise Form*, unless they are consecrated by Establishments? Are Love to the Deity, and Benevolence to our Fellow-Creatures of no value unless they have the stamp of *Church-Orthodoxy* upon them? Will you suggest that there are no Friends to Piety and to Mankind among Dissenters? In *point of Prudence* conceal such Sentiments, my Lord !

The Bishop of *London's Codex* is recommended to your Clergy †, “ to whom the Church of *England* “ is extremely obliged, as on other important Occa- “ sions, so particularly for that eminent Service done “ by him in his most elaborate Work, the Code “ of the *English* ecclesiastical Law ; together with his “ very judicious introductory Discourse concern- “ ing the present State of the Power, Discipline, “ and Laws of the Church of *England* ; — a “ Work which must be ever considered as a Stan-
G dard

* See Charge 1. p. 33.

† 1. Charge p. 35.

“ dard by all competent Judges.” How far I might chime with you in your Notions, were I as well paid for defending them as your Lordship, I can’t tell : But I must express my own Sentiments frankly, perhaps you’ll urge I have no *Interest* in view, and therefore — can be no competent Judge of the matter. This celebrated Standard has been justly deemed an *Insult* upon the Laws of the Nation, and if it escapes the Notice of the *Legislature*, it must be, because ’tis *too contemptible* to deserve it. I expect this Remark will procure many ecclesiastical *Anathema’s* ; but assure yourself, my Lord, I lay no greater Stress upon a *Pope’s Curse*, than I do upon a *Bishop’s Blessing*. But allowing this *spiritual Attorney*, all the Merit ascrib’d to him by your Lordship, — yet is not the Christian Church in general obliged to him, as well as the Church of *England* ? Or has he done no further Service to Christianity, than in constituting Church-Laws, and representing Church-Power as independent and boundless. — My Lord, I have a greater veneration for our Church, than to consider such exorbitant Claims as calculated, to give it any real Dignity, however they may aggrandize its Authority. But as there is “ scarce Honesty enough in the Nation, “ according to your Lordship, to save it from “ downright Ruin,” no wonder there should be a Set of Men that are zealous in betraying Virtue, as well as * Virtue’s Friends, and all under the specious Pretence of acting for the *good of the Church*.

’Tis allow’d, the ecclesiastical Constitution has “ some lesser Deficiencies, and if the present Age “ were suitable to so great a Work as that of a “ Review, carried on by Men of Temper and Candour, without Prejudices and Resentment, it “ might be brought to the highest Perfection on “ the present Foundation, that the nature of the “ thing

* See the Reasons of the Opposition to Dr. Rundle considere’d.

“ thing is capable of *.” I must beg leave to expostulate here with your Lordship. Is not our national Establishment *derived from the primitive Church*, p. 31, and yet subject to *lesser Deficiencies*? If so, why are we required to pay such an absolute Reverence to its Dictates and Authority? Or is that now become a human Constitution, which in p. 19, was *divine and heavenly*? But perhaps it will be urged, that 'tis both *perfectly human*, and *perfectly divine*, like the chimerical Existence set forth in a spurious celebrated Creed; tho' like that too, 'tis — neither made nor begotten in the reason of things, but proceeding from foolish Inventions. Why is not the present Age suitable to so great a Work as that of a Review? Have we no Men of Candour and Temper amongst us? May I be allowed to ask, without any Imputation of Flattery, what must the World conclude of *your Lordship*? What Account can be given of the *venerable Bench* — and the *whole Body of the Priesthood*? All Hypocrites and Bigots. — No, my Lord, we have Persons of the greatest Worth and Learning that adorn our Church, and do Honour to the Nation; Men that are not *afraid* of espousing the Principles of *Liberty*, nor *ashamed* of being *honest*. But, perhaps you'll urge that these are the very Men that bring the Church into Danger.

But however mean an Opinion your Lordship may form of Ecclesiastics, must the Laity be branded with the same Marks of Ignominy and Scandal? Shall a *British House of Commons* be arraign'd as constituted of Persons of no Honour or Integrity, — as Tyrants, Slaves, or Villains? — But I ask pardon, 'tis the Church's *distinguishing Character*, to be not only *exempt from*, but *above* all Lay-Power, and Jurisdiction. I appeal to yourself as to this, and humbly propose whether being refused the liberty

* 1 Charge, p. 36.

to confirm in a *certain regal Peculiar*, in the County of *Salop*, did not give *great*, I won't say *just* Offence to your Lordship? But I wave this, to make way for a Subject more agreeable to your Lordship's taste, — the *Parochial Rights* of *Tithes* and *Glebe-Lands*. 'Tis observable, as remarked before, that how contemptible soever the *Rights of Conscience* and the *Christian Church* are treated, *parochial Rights* engage your Lordship's particular Regards. Infidels scoff, and cry if the Clergy can but secure their *Tithes*, *Truth* may shift for herself. However, let *Tithes* and *Glebes* be inviolably preserved: I would not apply to them, what your Lordship doth to * *Christianity*, that they are an *Usurpation* on the *Rights* of Mankind. But, my Lord, 'tis an *established Opinion*, and I know you highly reverence *Notions* that are *established*, that you might have recommended to your *Clergy*, many more useful and instructive Lessons. But the Case stands thus, the loss of a *Tithe-Pig*, or an *Easter-Offering*, will make the Church totter, and shake its mighty Foundations. Any one who takes a view of the numberless Vexations and scandalous Prosecutions that have from time to time been carried on about small *Tithes*, will agree with me, that to recommend the study of the Gospel of Peace, would have been much more seasonable, tho' perhaps not so acceptable, a Subject as the study of *Parochial Rights* and Power. Who knows not that 'tis safer to trust an Orphan to the Guardianship of a hungry Miser, a Man's Carcase within the Paws of a hungry Lion, than to trust a weak scrupulous Conscience about *Tithes*, to the Mercy of a Legion of *hungry ravening Ecclesiastics*?

But having left the Church in full possession of her legal Rights, we are next to enquire after her Patrimony. There are, it seems, † “ many Im-
“ propri-

* See Charge 1. p. 21.

† Charge 1. p. 38.

“ propriations in your Lordship’s Diocess, and the Church’s Patrimony has been alienated.” But what Church’s, my Lord? The Church of *England’s* or of *Rome’s*? A Protestant or a Popish Church’s? You’ll not pretend that Impropropriations were the Patrimony of our Mother-Church? They never belonged to her; nor can I account, my Lord, for your ascertaining a Title to them, upon any other footing, than this; —That as the Church of *Rome* is no more in this Land, your Lordship lays claim to her Possessions by right of Inheritance, as being next a-kin. But, notwithstanding your “*distinguishing Character*,” and the *Divinity* of uninterrupted Succession, the *Entail* is cut off, to your Disappointment, my Lord.

Why are not the like Complaints usher’d, that *Infallibility* has been disclaimed and rejected? Your Lordship’s Pretensions may hold equally strong as to both. ’Tis almost needless to remark, that this glorious Patrimony was the Fruits of *ecclesiastical Knavery* and *Oppression*. The Priests enriched themselves upon the Spoils of *Honesty* and *Virtue*, compounded with *Assassins*, *Cut-throats*, or *Robbers*, to pardon all their Sins for a rich Legacy to the Church; and thus the *Reverend Deceivers* soon found trafficking in Salvation to be a gainful Trade, as the polite Dr. *Young* has expressed it,

—Dying Sinners, to blot out their Score,
Bequeath’d the Church the Leavings of a Whore.
Universal Passion.

The Alienation of what your Lordship calls the Patrimony of the Church, is well known to be the main Pillar of the Reformation. And would you propose that all the Lands engross’d by the Church before the time of King *Henry VIII.* should be restored to it again? Be *consistent*, my Lord, tho’ we disclaim *Popish Superstitions*, stand up for an
English

English Infallibility, and Courts of Inquisition, and establish an Hierarchy, resembling that of *Rome* in all its Scenes of *pompous Villany* and *Horrors*. Let the Church's Patrimony be appropriated to the original Intention. Let the Clergy enjoy all the *Lands and Ladies* in *Great-Britain*; and as to *Honesty* and *Conscience*, let them take their Fate! None can judge this Representation to be foreign to what you have advanced, if 'tis compared with what follows, that 'tis *absolutely necessary* to preserve and defend small Tithes. How *absolutely necessary*, my Lord? Doth the Happiness of Mankind, the Growth of Virtue and Knowledge, depend upon an oppressive Exactness in collecting of Tithes? Be the *Subsistence* of Vicars dependent upon them, yet, my Lord, *Christianity* may *subsist* without. If Impropropriations are the Patrimony of the Church, then of consequence the Legislature concerned in such Alienation, were guilty of notorious Sacrilege and High-Treason against the Clergy, in robbing them of their consecrated Dues. — But I forbear. — 'Tis enough that your Lordship disapproves of the Doctrines of the *Romish* Church as *unsound* and *heterodox*; yet it seems there is a deal of *Orthodoxy* in her Treasures. Permit me to enquire, my Lord, what kept the World so long in *awful Ignorance* and *Darkness*? Was it not the Patrimony of the Church? What has been the *Parent* of *Bigotry*, and *nursed Superstition* throughout many successive Ages? What has been the *Foundation* of *Priestcraft*, *Idolatry*, and *Error*? What has made *Light* *Darkness*, and *Good* *Evil*? still this *solemn thing*, the Patrimony of the Church, my Lord. What has made *Liberty* *unfashionable*, and *Mobs* *venerable and sacred*? — Is it not the Patrimony of the Church, that gave birth to all this, my Lord?

But may it please you, to consider, how foreign those Instructions are to those delivered by Christ
and

and his Apostles? and yet, notwithstanding all this, a Church without Patrimony, in your Lordship's Estimation, like a fair Lady without Fortune, loses all her Charms: and in both Cases alike, neither to be wedded for her engaging Accomplishments, but for the sake of profuse Wealth and Dowry. — However, admitting it *absolutely necessary* to preserve Tithes, yet I believe few will imagine it *absolutely necessary* to inculcate this upon the minds of the Clergy. Nay, my Lord, many think it *absolutely necessary* to have Laws enacted to restrain your *little ecclesiastical Pettifoggers* from carrying on litigious and scandalous Prosecutions. Will your Lordship recommend the Conduct of an *Apostate Angel*, to the Imitation of the sacred Priesthood, and call upon them to cast Men into * Prison? Are *Augmentation Offices*, my Lord, the great Charters of our Faith and Worship? Or are these the *Divinities in fashion*, and as such worshipped by a Sett of Men, whose *distinguishing Character* is (for surely we may believe your Lordship) on all other Occasions, to expect Adoration paid to themselves †?

I shall make no Remarks on what is hinted by your Lordship relating to Church-Donations. The Legislature has wisely check'd the Progress of all Priestly Juggling and Imposture from this Quarter, and put an end to the Church's being pampered with the Heritage of Oppressions! — But amongst all the curious Reflections that both your Lordship's Charges abound with, nothing surprizes me so much, as to see it asserted by a *Divine*, a *Bishop* of our Church ‡, that the Times are so *extreamly bad*, that there is *scarce Honesty enough* left to save the Nation from *downright Ruin*. The highest Compliment I can bestow upon this Occasion, is, that
you

* Rev. ii. 10.

† See 2 Charge, p. 54.

‡ 1 Charge, p. 41.

you were not *in earnest* when you delivered this. However, let us examine into the matter. As the *spiritual Commissioners*, (I won't say of Trade, for that would be sinking them into a Level with the Governors of other Societies, amongst whom I hope *the Principles* of Honesty are common*) but as the *spiritual Commissioners* of Heaven claim our highest Regards, we'll begin our Remarks there. What will your Lordship represent the whole Body of the Clergy to be? What will become of the whole *Cavalry* of the Church, Archbishops, Bishops and Deans; Prebends, Archdeacons, Vicars, Apparitors, and Curates? Have they done nothing to promote the Interest of Virtue? Or have they corrupted the World, palm'd Superstition on Mankind for Religion, and Mimickry for Christian Worship? Are all their Pretensions to Piety only Priestcraft and Hypocrisy? And doth the Matter in Fact stand thus, that there is *little Honesty* amongst them? Is their *Zeal* for the Church, their *solemn Subscriptions* to its Articles, their lifting themselves into its Service, only the Offspring of Self-Interest? What regard can Kings pay to their *Oaths*, the *Laitie* to their *Preaching*, and the *World* to their *Function*, if their *distinguishing Character* be this, that there is *scarce any Honesty* amongst them? What are all the outward Appearances of Devotion, Fasting, and Prayer, by which our Church is eminently distinguished? Is there nothing in all this, my Lord, but a Trick of the Priests to get Money? Are they only *devout* out of *Knavery*, and do they worship the Almighty not for *Grace*, but *Gold*? If so, of what mighty Importance are *fulsome Panegyrics*, on the Sanctity of national Churches? A *commissioned Priesthood* that doth not reform the World, is a *Disgrace* to Christianity, and an *Insult* upon common Sense. Wherever *solemn Cheats* are imposed

* See 2 Charge, P. 58.

posed upon the Public, and virtually confessed to be of no Service to the Country, 'tis a Blessing to have such Rogueries detected, and 'tis a piece of Justice to punish the *Abettors* of them, as so many strolling Conjurers and Vagrants. A Church without *Honesty*, like a Prostitute without *Shame* or *Virtue*, may betray Innocence and seduce Multitudes into Ruin, but can never be useful to any State or Nation. However, these are the natural and just Consequences of the Principles laid down by your Lordship, that there is "scarce Honesty enough in the Nation to save it from downright Ruin." 'Tis allowed, there will be Knaves and Fools in all Professions. However, I must differ from you, my Lord, and maintain that we have many excellent and learned Divines belonging to our Church, whose Characters and Accomplishments are as illustrious as their Stations. I could give a Catalogue, but I know it would offend your Lordship's Modesty to be inserted amongst them, and therefore shall decline the Task. — In the next place, in what Views must the *English* Laity be painted? I must repeat the Question. Must the Majority of a *British House of Commons* be stigmatized as Men of no Honesty? Are the Guardians of our Liberties, the Gentry of the Nation, Enemies to Truth and Virtue? Are there not Thousands and ten Thousands in this Kingdom, in lower Spheres of Life, who behave very worthily in their Stations? Yes, my Lord, we have Plowmen, that in their Capacity are as serviceable to their Country, as Bishops? ----- I am apprized, my Lord, 'tis the *Fashion* to deem all those *Infidels* who can't see the reasonableness of High-Churchmen's Opinions; yet I am so weak as to believe the Times are not so bad as your Lordship represents them. I can't pretend to form a Judgment what Character *that part of Mankind* deserves, which

H

your

your Lordship is most conversant with ; but shall still maintain this, that there is more Honesty in the Nation now, than in former Ages, when *Ecclesiastics* were our *Rulers*, and when *Tyranny* was *licensed* from the Throne. However, I am sorry that a Person of your Lordship's Character and Reputation has the Misfortune, according to your own Account, to be acquainted with few * * * but such as are — abandoned Miscreants and Villains.

I must confess, my Lord, when I have heard some *rigid Fanatics* of different Denominations, pouring out their Spleen and Investives against Nature, urging that their Iniquities were entailed upon them by their Fathers ; and not only that they were *Knaves*, which perhaps none ever disputed, but that they were *Knaves* by *their very Extraction* ; it has given me a very mean Idea of the Abettors of such Principles and Notions. I can't conceive why such *dishonourable* and *low* Sentiments should be entertained of human Nature, unless it be that the Authors of them have conversed amongst the lowest Part of their Species ; or otherwise are Persons of no Virtue or Character themselves. 'Tis natural enough to form an Opinion of others from those Dispositions that are most prevalent and commanding in ourselves. — It can't be imagin'd, that this latter should be the Case as to your Lordship.

But, my Lord, as the hard Names of Infidels and Heretics have been oft awkwardly apply'd to discountenance free Enquiries into Truth, so many will judge, that 'tis no more than an artful Bugbear, to suggest that there is scarce any Honesty in the Nation. Your Lordship will not presume to deny that we have wise Governors and Rulers: The Laity no longer hug their Chains: They dare think for themselves, without soliciting Leave of the Clergy. But perhaps it might be your Lordship's Opinion, that 'tis owing to *want of Honesty*,
that

that *Laymen* ever think at all. 'Tis their Duty not to puzzle themselves with Reason, but to obey their spiritual Guides, and implicitly submit to their Directions.

The Danger of the Church calls afresh for our Regards *, “ the Tithes-Bill, and what is connected “ with it, the Fate of the Christian Religion,” should awaken our Fears, and alarm all our Passions. — 'Tis well known that *tacking Bills* have been as fashionable as scandalous in the State, and now it seems something of the same nature must be introduced into Religion. *The Tithes-Bill* and the *Fate of Christianity connected!* Wherein doth *Christianity* consist? Is it not in reverence to the Deity, in social Virtue and Goodness? and can't these subsist without *Tithes*, nay, without any *Priesthood* at all? In primitive Times there were no Stipends annexed to Preaching, and yet Christianity triumphed over *High-Church Priests* and *Heathenism*, and made a victorious Progress. But has it gain'd ground proportionable to the increase of Church-Wealth and Power? The very reverse, my Lord. When Christian Priests became pampered with Pride and Luxury, and grew insolent in Tyranny, Religion starv'd, and Piety lost ground in proportion. 'Tis observable, as the immortal *Milton* has expressed it; “ That so long as the Church, in true “ imitation of Christ, can be content to ride upon an “ Ass, carrying herself and her Government along “ in a mean and simple Guise, she may be, as he “ is, a Lion of the Tribe of *Judah*, and in her “ Humility, all Men with loud Hosannahs will “ confess her greatness; but when, despising the “ mighty Operation of the Spirit by the weak “ things of this World, she thinks to make herself bigger and more considerable, by using the “ way of civil Force and Jurisdiction, as she sits
H 2 “ upon

* Charge 1. p. 42.

“ upon this Lion she changes into an Ass, and
 “ instead of Hosannahs, every Man pelts her with
 “ Stones and Dirt.” And indeed, to be plain,
 my Lord, tho’ Men of consecrated Character have
 the Privilege to say what they please, yet should
 Laymen ever represent the Church as *independent of*
all secular Authority, they would be deemed *accom-*
plished Asses, were it not — that they are in dan-
 ger of *losing their Ears!*

“ * The *important Out-works* of our ecclesiastical
 “ Establishment, the *Corporation and Test-Acts*,”
 next open to our View. I never fully discovered the
 Reason before, why our Church is always in dan-
 ger. In danger it will be always, my Lord, un-
 less fix’d upon a more solid Basis and Foundation.
 ’Tis an undutiful Reflection from a Son of the
 Church, that has been nursed with Tenderness in
 her Bosom, and shared in her choicest Blessings, to
 suggest that she can’t maintain her Ground without
 invading the Rights of Mankind. Is the Authority
 of the Church to be supported not by dint of Rea-
 son, but by oppressive tyrannical Power? Maho-
 metism and Popery will of course rival her in all
 her Glories. My Lord, ’tis beneath the Character
 of a wise Master Builder to insinuate, that *Church-*
Architecture is never safe without such *political Scaf-*
folds and *Buttresses* to erect and support it. Will
 your Lordship confess no Divinity but Power, and
 pay Homage to no God but that of Riches? Why
 so much Bustle then about the *Sacredness* of Church-
 Rights? Your Lordship has cleared up the Matter.
Sampson’s Riddle, when applied to this, carries along
 with it no *Mystery* at all. Out of the *Eater* comes
 forth *Meat*, and out of the *Strong* comes forth
Sweetness.

But, my Lord, are these *important Out-works* of
 the Establishment, of any Importance in recom-
 mending

* Charge i. p. 42.

mending Virtue and Christian Sincerity ? How preposterous would such a Declaration as this appear ! — I solemnly commemorate the Sufferings of my Redeemer, with a View not to improve my Morals, but to be qualified for a Post — in the Church or Army. No wonder, my Lord, if Infidels ridicule Christianity, when Churchmen themselves thus avowedly blaspheme one of its most solemn Institutions. 'Tis shocking to see such flagrant and scandalous Wickedness encouraged. But I have so great a Veneration for the Orthodox Sons of the Church, that I would not put such an Affront upon their Honesty, as to imagine that they are sincere, when they represent the receiving the Eucharist, as a Duty of great Solemnity and Importance. Did they *believe* this, they would at least rival the Piety of — your Lordship can tell whom, and *tremble* at such an infamous Prostitution of it, to serve ambitious and worldly Views. The Corporation and Test-Acts are the *important Out-works of the Establishment* in the same Sense as Racks, Inquisitions, the Doctrines of Infallibility, Penances, Pilgrimages, and Absolutions, are the *important Out-works* of another Communion. They are calculated to establish Craft, to give Sanction to Superstition, and raise up a Kingdom of tyrannical Priests upon the *Ruins of Christ's Church and Kingdom*.

I leave your Lordship to give a full Loose to your pathetic visionary Fears, in the succeeding Pages, concerning the Distress and Danger of the Church. Lord pity the miserable Creature that has lain under such bitter Anguish and Affliction. Restore Health, Ignorance, and Infallibility amongst all her Sons. Propagate Tyranny, establish Confusion in the Land. Let Liberty sicken, let Virtue die, and the Church will for ever live and reign in Peace. Let your Lordship say *Amen* to this, and
let

let all good Churchmen bless you, and those of your Lordship's Principles, as the Saviour of their Church and Nation.

As * *Pamela's* Address to an Heathen Deity, was canonized by the Adoption of the *Royal Martyr*; so I make no question, if this Prayer should be adopted by *your Lordship*, but that it would be counted Orthodox, not only by all *your Friends*, but likewise by all the *professed Enemies* to his present Majesty's Government and Administration. To shew with what Propriety it may be used by you, I shall transcribe at length a few Passages that contain a lively Image of your Lordship's Zeal for the Church †.

“ At so critical a Juncture, when common Christianity is treated with an avowed Contempt
 “ and open Prophaneness; when an undisguised
 “ Immorality prevails so very generally; when
 “ there is scarce Honesty enough left to save the
 “ Nation from downright Ruin; when, with regard to the established Church in particular,
 “ the royal Supremacy is professedly exposed as
 “ inconsistent with the Rights of Conscience, even
 “ that Supremacy, which was the Ground-work
 “ of the Reformation among us from Popery,
 “ which was acknowledged and sworn to by the
 “ old *Puritans* themselves, tho' now inconsistently
 “ enough disowned and condemned in the new
 “ History and Vindication of them and their Principles;
 “ and that too, after a Toleration had been
 “ allowed to the present Dissenters, which was not
 “ to the *Puritans*; when so destructive an Attempt
 “ has been made on the legal Maintenance
 “ of the Clergy, as the late Tithe-Bill, and consequently on the Subsistence of the Priesthood,
 “ and

* A Prayer used by an imaginary Lady, in Sir P. S. *Arcadia*, and used by King C. as his own, in the famous *Eikon Basilike*.

† Charge 1. p. 41.

“ and what is connected with it, I mean, the Fate
 “ of the Christian Religion amongst us; when,
 “ an Attack has been so lately made on the im-
 “ portant Out-works of our ecclesiastical Esta-
 “ blishment, the Corporation and Test-Acts,
 “ with the greatest Insolence towards the esta-
 “ blished Church, and most undutiful Menaces of
 “ the civil Government, in the controversial Pam-
 “ phlets on that Subject; when, under the solemn
 “ Pretence of reforming the Abuses of the ecclesi-
 “ astical Courts, all episcopal Authority has so
 “ lately been well-nigh undermined, or rather cut
 “ up by the Roots, in that Scheme of Reforma-
 “ tion, as it was originally formed: And if that
 “ Order had been rendered useless, as no doubt
 “ it would have been, though when stripp’d of all
 “ Authority, it is natural to infer, that the Reve-
 “ nues of it would have been soon thought useless
 “ too, to Men depriv’d of all real Authority;
 “ and that therefore the Order itself, in result
 “ of Things, might have been considered as super-
 “ fluous, and perhaps, in due time, thought fit
 “ to be abolished as insignificant: When, again,
 “ Churches themselves, the great Instruments of
 “ preserving some Sense of Religion among us,
 “ have lately been put in such a Method of Repairs,
 “ as probably would have ended in the irretrievable
 “ Ruin of the greater part of them in no long
 “ period of Time: When, likewise, the Correction
 “ of Abuses of Matrimonial Licences is well
 “ known to have been laboured in so absurd a man-
 “ ner, as to have permitted the Marriage of Mi-
 “ nors of each Sex, without the Consent of their
 “ Parents or Guardians; tho’ the late pretended
 “ Reformation of ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, was
 “ originally founded on an irregular Marriage,
 “ and an absurd Licence: When, once more,
 “ to compleat so bad a Prospect, the proposed Re-
 “ formation

“ formation of episcopal Jurisdiction, has derived
 “ its Origin from some Persons that have professed
 “ no small Zeal for the Church of *England*, but
 “ who have not disdained to copy after the avowed
 “ Adversaries of the Church, in the beginning of the
 “ Times of Confusion : When these melancholly
 “ Circumstances, I say, have so lately concurred,
 “ (the Consequences of which, are not perhaps, so
 “ generally understood by the parochial Clergy,
 “ in parts remote from the great Scene of Business,
 “ as they ought to be) it is natural to infer from
 “ the whole, that our Zeal for the established
 “ Church, ought to bear a just Proportion to the
 “ Danger of its present Situation; as likewise,
 “ that it ought to be suitable to our Knowledge of
 “ its Constitution, in consequence of the most dili-
 “ gent Enquiries into the Grounds and Foundation
 “ of it. If these are not proper Occasions for
 “ zeal for our ecclesiastical Constitution, it is not
 “ easy to assign Circumstances that may justly de-
 “ mand it.”

Surely, my Lord, *Cain's Curse* has been entailed
 upon the Church in these latter Ages. — Every one
 that finds me will *slay* me. — I'll not pretend to
 say, that 'tis for the same Reason, because it de-
 lights in Bloodshed and lordly lawless Jurisdiction,
 where it has no right to exert any Authority at all.
 But, my Lord, it may be neither uninstruative nor
 unentertaining, to take a View how this *ecclesiasti-
 cal Shuttle-cock*, the Danger of the Church, has been
 play'd about on different and repeated Occasions.
 The Danger of the Church was warmly urged to
 bring the glorious Revolution into Disgrace ; the
 Danger of the Church was pleaded against the Act
 of Toleration, for weak and scrupulous Consciences.
 — The Danger of the Church was likewise the
 Foundation of the Schism-Bill ; the Danger of the
 Church betrayed the brave *Catalans*, and patched
 up

up the scandalous Peace of *Utrecht*. — The Danger of the Church was at the head of the *Preston* Rebellion ; and the Danger of this tottering unwieldy Fabric has nurs'd all the rude Insolencies offered to his present Majesty's Government, whom may God long preserve. About the thirtieth of *January* the Church is yearly in more imminent Danger, as has been observed by Sir *Richard Steele*, in his incomparable *Letter to the Pope*. A *Treatise* I would recommend to the frequent and diligent Perusal of your Lordship. But one would think, from the Continuance of that *Anniversary*, that God Almighty pays but small Regards to the Cries and Prayers of the Church, and that the Priests, whatever Interest they may have on Earth, have but little in Heaven ; inasmuch that they have been praying near a hundred Years, for the forgiveness of one Sin, and yet by God, as well as Men, unforgiven still ; for solemn *Party Rage*, and *Party Prayers*, are yet annually observed on the Occasion.

In the Year 1705, the Complaints of the Danger of the Church spread abroad to distract the Kingdom with unreasonable and groundless Distrusts and Jealousies, incurr'd a severe Censure from the Legislature of the Nation, and “ it was resolved, by the “ Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons “ in Parliament assembled, That the Church of *England*, as by Law established, which was rescued “ from the extremest Danger, by King *William* “ the Third, of glorious Memory, is now, by “ God's Blessing, under the happy Reign of her “ present Majesty, in a most safe and flourishing “ Condition ; and that whosoever goes about to “ suggest the Church is in Danger under her Majesty's Administration, is an Enemy to the “ Queen, the Church, and the Kingdom.” — You dare not suggest, my Lord, but that our present gracious Sovereign, is as cordial and sincere a

Friend to the Church as the late Queen *Anne*. Should your Lordship's Outcries therefore, of the Church's Danger, be deemed worthy of Parliamentary Notice, must you not expect in parliamentary Language, to be marked out as an *Enemy* to his Majesty, the Church, and the Kingdom? Would you not be attainted with *propagating* Faction, and *promoting* unreasonable and groundless Distrusts and Jealousies among the King's liege Subjects? Is this the Commission, my Lord, that you have been entrusted with from Heaven? Or this the *distinguishing Character* which is your boasted Claim? If so, let it be despised, let it be unenvied, but let it never be imitated by any true Protestants, or any sincere Lovers of their Country. According to your Lordship, 'tis dangerous to attempt any further Reforms in the Church, tho' you acknowledge such Reforms are wanting. You allow there are lesser Deficiencies in our ecclesiastical Constitution, and yet the remedying of these ought not to be attempted. Such inconsistent innovating Schemes can never do Honour to Christianity; and tho' they may take with the besotted Part of the Nation, such as are Enthusiasts for Craft and Power, yet they'll meet with a juster Fate from all Men of sound Reason and sober Understandings.

I find it is asserted by your Lordship, " that the
 " *professed Friends* of the Church, are entering into a
 " Conspiracy against it. I can't appropriate the
 " Honour of this Remark, solely to your Lord-
 " ship. — I have oft heard as much from a *tumul-*
 " *tuous Rabble* at Country Elections *. Some
 " Persons that have professed no small zeal for the
 " Church of *England*, have not disdained to copy af-
 " ter the *avowed Adversaries* of the Church, in the
 " beginning of the times of Confusion. Who were
 " those *avowed Adversaries*, my Lord? *Hampden*
 " and

* 1 Charge, p. 44.

“ and other illustrious Patriots, whose Names will
 “ engage a grateful Reverence, when little Pam-
 “ phleteers, that deal about *common-place* Rage
 “ and Invective, will be either despised or forgotten.”
 ’Tis said by your Lordship, “ foreign Protestants
 “ are not to be molested, but our dissenting Pro-
 “ testants * at home, demand a very different
 “ Conduct. That is, according to your Lordship,
 “ as we differ from them in our Notions concerning
 “ the *Importance* of Ceremonies, and the *Piety* of
 “ Impositions, so neither ought we to be united
 “ with them in an amicable Intercourse, and chari-
 “ table Sentiments as to other Matters. Let our
 “ Charity towards them extend no further than
 “ we are directed by Self-interest and Advantage.
 “ Let them be painted as so many Monsters in na-
 “ ture. Represent them in the same Views as *In-*
 “ *fidels* do High-Churchmen, a *Pack of Knaves*
 “ and *Enthusiasts*. But, † in *point of Prudence*,
 “ says your Lordship, let us not give any just Sus-
 “ picions of our Disgust to the legal Toleration of
 “ them.” In *point of Prudence*, is this the highest
 Pitch of your Lordship’s Charity and Religion?
 Are your Lordship’s *Regards for Christianity asleep*?
 Or are the *divine Rights* of Tithes and Episcopacy,
 the *only Essentials* of your Lordship’s Faith? In
point of Prudence, we are not to appear open Advo-
 cates for Persecution. — *The Times* won’t bear this.
 — The Church is *sick* and in Danger, for we have
 a Protestant Prince on the Throne, who will not be
jockey’d by *Ecclesiastics* out of the Affections and
 Liberties of his Subjects. — In *point of Prudence*, we
 must sit easy under these *melancholy* Circumstances,
 and not attempt to crush those whom the *Legislature*
believes to be our *Fellow-Creatures*. But, my Lord,
 it requires no great Degree of Saintship to prophe-
 sy, what would be their *Fate*, were it left to you,

I 2

Lord.

* Charge i. p. 46.

† Ibid.

Lordship's *charitable Decision*. Were it *prudential*, you would readily concur in the good work of *cur-sing* and *dragooning* these *Heretics* into their right Minds. Were it *prudential*, the Act de *Hæretico comburendo* should be publicly defended, and *Smithfield Flames* should never *sleep or die*. I would gladly be informed, whether *Prudentials* constitute the whole of your Lordship's Religion? Whether our *Loyalty*, like our *Charity*, is to be carried on in *point of Prudence*, my Lord? Whether it be not in *point of Prudence* only, that you swear *Allegiance* to the King, and acknowledge the *Royal Supremacy*. — I would likewise submit it to your Lordship's judicious Determination, whether *Points of Virtue*, of *Honesty*, of *Conscience*, ought to pay homage to *points of Prudence*, or not? But perhaps your Lordship may not think it a *point of Prudence*, to give a determinate Answer to this. In *point of Prudence*, “ we are not to give any just Suspensions, that we “ envy or grudge them that Indulgence allowed “ them, of worshipping God after their own man- “ ner, and of enjoying without Disturbance, the “ Dictates of their own Consciences.” I find, my Lord, our dissenting Protestants are just as much indebted to your Lordship, as good Christians are to him whose *distinguishing Character* is, that he seeks whom he may devour. They are in no Danger from him, because — he is not in a Capacity to hurt or destroy them. In *point of Prudence*, we are not to *hang* or *burn* them for saying their Prayers, tho' our *Affiduity* in collecting *Church-Tithes*, should allow us no time to *pray* ourselves. But if they decry Establishments, were it in our power, Vengeance and Blood should pursue them! Let the *Sword* be girt on, and *sheath* it in their Gore and Bowels! These are the natural Consequences of your Lordship's Zeal.

But, it seems, they are so fond of Power, or Posts
of

of Authority, as to labour at breaking down the Fences of the established Church, and thereby place themselves on a level with the national Establishment, on Occasion of merely secular Matters that are confessedly foreign to our religious Pretensions*. How can Christianity suffer, if those Fences were broken down, that your Lordship acknowledges to be of no Importance to Religion? But, it seems, Lust after Power and Posts of Authority, tho' foreign to *religious Pretensions*, yet are so far from being *foreign*, that they are *essential* to the Character of a *good Churchman*.

Tho' weak *Fanatics* may discover an avowed Contempt of secular matters, when they stand in competition with their Duty, yet I am still willing to believe, that you will not admit secular Matters to be foreign to *your Lordship's religious Pretensions*. The Reader will agree with me, when he reflects on what you have asserted on *Tithe-Bills* and the *Fate of Christianity*, being immediately and necessarily connected. According to this, the Property of the Almighty ought to be transferr'd to his *Vicegerents*; the *Earth*, and the *fullness thereof*, should be no longer the *Lord's*, but the *Clergy's*.

How far the Government "has exerted itself in quashing the *Tithe-Bill* and *Corporation* and *Test-Acts*," is none of my Business to consider. If in fact it be so, I presume, my Lord, they don't think themselves much obliged to you for the Discovery; and perhaps they would not, in *point of Prudence*, trust your Lordship with a *Secret*, as soon as a *Translation*.

"Our Zeal for the Constitution of the national Church, ought to be accompanied with Charity towards those who unhappily dissent from it:" Yes, in *point of Prudence*, my Lord. I shall not enter into the Reason that obliged your Lordship to take

* Charge 1. p. 42.

take notice of the Innovation complained of in your Diocese, with reference to the Burial of the baptized Children of Protestant Dissenters*. Nor shall I, at this time, take upon me to enquire, whether Baptism was intended as a standing Dispensation in the Christian Church, or was to be of temporary Duration. This is obvious to all, that the Commission given the Apostles to baptize, extended no further than to themselves. *I'll be with you to the end of the World.* Will any one pretend that God Almighty has always been with the Priesthood, or that he has danced Attendance upon a *corrupt tyrannical Clergy*? This is certain, my Lord, that *Baptism* has oft been represented more like a Charm, than a rational useful Institution. Some time ago, an orthodox Divine in *your Lordship's Diocese too*, administering private Baptism to an Infant, the Water was brought in a wooden Bowl. The Ceremony being concluded, the *Reverend Enthusiast* took occasion to address the Parent in the following manner: Sir, You are to understand, this Bowl has been *consecrated* by virtue of my *Priestly Authority and Function*. It would be *Sacrilege* to defile it for any vulgar Use and Service, and therefore, by way of prevention, I take the *liberty* to burn it. Accordingly he disposed of the *wooden Idol*, and warm'd himself by the Fire his Zeal had kindled. I presume, my Lord, had it been a silver Bowl, he would have acted with a still greater holy Caution, and to preserve it from Pollution, would have taken the liberty to have *appropriated* it to *himself*, as a sacred Treasure appertaining to the Church. — I mention this, in Honour of your Lordship, to shew that the Zeal you recommend for the Church, has not been lost upon your Clergy.

Having considered many Specimens of your
Lord-

* Charge 1. p. 49.

Lordship's Zeal, we are now arrived at *one* Instance of your Charity. 'Tis granted by you, that baptized Dissenters are — Christians. But what are we to understand by their being Christians at large? Are they possessed of more generous catholic Principles, or a more benevolent Character than those who belong to our Church and Communion? Or doth your Lordship mean, that they are the Dross of Nature, and the Refuse of the World. I promise to see this explained by your Lordship, in a Key to your Charge, whenever the World is favoured with a second Edition of it. — You have entred into some Particulars, to contribute to set scrupulous Clergymen right. But this is to be effected in a more compendious way, than by dint of Reasoning and Persuasion; a *Scarf*, a *Ring*, and a *Funeral Sermon*, is an approved and infallible Remedy, my Lord, to remove the Scruples of all *conscientious Vicars, Curates, or Bishops*, concerning the lawfulness of burying Protestant Dissenters in consecrated Clay. I flatter myself, that this Prescription will not fail of your Lordship's favourable Recommendation.

I have the Pleasure to agree with you, my Lord, that all Encomiums of our ecclesiastical Constitution, are vain and insignificant Things, unless we shew the great Advantage of it in the Influence it has on our Lives and Conversations. It doth not necessarily follow, that the Sons of the Church are *Heirs* of Heaven, because they *inherit* a great Part of the *Wealth* and *Power* of the Nation. Zeal for a Hierarchy, is not always attended with common Honesty, much less is it an infallible Token of divine Grace. Nor doth it follow, that because our Names are enrolled in the Register, that therefore they are writ in the Book of Life. Your Lordship well knows that consecrated Bricks, Clay, and Timber have been the *Idol-Divinities* of modern Times.

Times. Episcopal Benedictions have made Stocks and Stones as wise and holy, as those who bestowed the Blessing upon them. A *religious Reverence* has been paid to Beings that have neither Eyes to see, Ears to hear, nor Hearts to conceive ; and not only they who *worship*, but they who *canonized them*, have been like unto them, and so is *every one* that *trusteth* in them. But, my Lord, I would gladly be informed, whether the beauty of Holiness can consist in things that have neither Beauty nor Holiness in them. As it is the *People* that constitutes the *Church*, so 'tis a *good People* that makes a *good Church*, a *People orthodox in their Lives*, that makes an *orthodox Church* ; tho' a low sottish profligate Deportment, is an *essential Characteristic* of an *infallible Church* ; and whilst the glorious Pillars of it are sober enough to *stand* upon their own Limbs, their Church will be in Danger of *falling*. Where such a Spirit prevails, Christianity must languish under its malignant and baneful Influence. We may as soon expect the *Devil* to turn *Moralist*, or a *Miser* to be *charitable and honest*, as hope that a *Priesthood* should *reform* the World, that are themselves *professed Enemies* to the *Principles* of *Liberty* and *Reformation*. The most elevated Pretensions to Sanctity, unless adorned by a suitable Conduct, like the Charms of a common Prostitute, lose all their Beauty and Force.

Rather, therefore, my Lord, than *consecrate* Tyranny with an *Air of Devotion* ; rather than adopt *unchristian* Usurpations into our excellent Church ; rather than *metamorphose* the Clergy into Harpies, exert your Zeal in recommending moral Virtue, Benevolence and Charity, to their Choice and Esteem. Let the Language of the Pulpit be Peace and Truth. Set an Example before your Brethren, first, to preach, and next of all, to preach not themselves, but — Christ Jesus. Convince them, my Lord,
that

that it will give a greater *Dignity* to their Character, to be Ministers of Righteousness, than to be the *Pimps* of a Faction, the *Lacqueys* of Infallibility, and the *Promoters* of Strife and Wrath. But your Lordship is no Friend to *Innovations* in the Church, and therefore possibly may reject all this.

Many have been deemed Enemies to the Church, for no other Reason, in the Opinion of fallible Men, than their Attachment to uncorrupt Christianity; and Infidels have thought, that more have incur'd the Censure of *ecclesiastical Damnation* for their Honesty, than for their want of Grace. 'Tis possible, nay, 'tis common to be a good Churchman, without ever attending the Services of the Church at all; and yet an *Apostate* from the Church, has been counted a more dreadful Hydra, than an *Apostate* from Grace and Goodness. I am led to these Reflections, by what your Lordship observes, that your Adversaries, that is, as you have explained yourself, those who dissent from us, are gone off from that *outward Appearance* of Sanctity, and Severity of Morals, with which those of their Party first set out, and *varnish'd* over the Cause of *Puritanism*, and the subsequent Separation. If this Remark shews any thing, besides Weakness and Malice, it must be this, — that an *outward Appearance* of Sanctity, a mere *Varnish* of Piety, is all that your Lordship thinks necessary to recommend to your Clergy. But, my Lord, doth it not betray the most accomplished Partiality, that that Severity of Morals should, on all former Occasions, be represented by Men of your Lordship's Principles, as Fanaticism and Enthusiasm, and that the Refinements of that Party should now be arraigned, as proceeding from want of Zeal.

I must not forget to take notice of your Lordship's charitable Disposition, in treating all those as

K

your

your Adversaries, who entertain any Notions different from those which are established. Instead of saying we are Brethren, why should we fall out by the way? 'Tis thought proper to kindle Men's Passions against them, and make them *easier Sacrifices* to the Zeal and Devotion of a Mob. But, my Lord, why are they counted Adversaries? Do they hate Bishops? — No, they wish we had many more that — would be wise, faithful and honest. Do they declare against Christianity? — No, they confess the Bible to be the only infallible Rule and Standard! Do they decry a Ministry in the Church? — No, they oppose only those who would lord it over God's Heritage, and claim Dominion over their Faith. Do their Clergy swear Allegiance to the King, and as under God, the *supreme Ruler of the Church*; and yet place themselves *on a level* with the *civil Constitution* itself; nay, *independent* of all secular Authority? — No, they have appeared hearty Friends to the Protestant Government and Succession, without Equivocation, and without Reserve; and, which is more, without any Prospect of raising themselves to any Episcopal Dignities or Honours! Can these be your Reasons, why they are treated as your Adversaries, my Lord? I leave your Lordship to determine this. —

I pass by your Complaints of the ill Morals and Infidelity of the Age, as having been already considered, and proceed to consider the Characters you attribute to the Clergy *. — They are Christ's Ambassadors. — 'Tis with Pleasure I express the high Veneration I owe to worthy and learned Clergymen, such as appear to be Persons of Candor, Knowledge and Integrity; and such there be, who are an Ornament to human Nature. But in general, are not those who profess themselves Ministers of the Christian Dispensation, subject to like Passions

* Charge i. p. 55

sions with others, as covetous, as tyrannical, as immoral, and as ignorant as others? Are these Christ's Ambassadors? As for my part, I entertain a higher Notion of the Author of the Christian Religion, than to believe that he would intrust either Fools or Knaves with a solemn Embassy and Commission, not to mention that those whom your Lordship represents as the *Ambassadors of Christ*, and consequently of *Love and Peace*, have frequently been the *Promoters of Discord*, and the *Heralds of Wrath and Destruction*. Are they Watchmen? — Let them watch over *Souls* as well as *Tithes*! And let them pray not for Wealth, which is a Blessing they enjoy in common with the rest of Mankind, but for Truth and Grace! Are they *Shepherds*? — Let them *feed* as well as *sheer* their Flocks, and let them not turn a House of Prayers into a Den of Thieves, and gull Men of their Fortunes and Understandings together! Have they spiritual Powers that are in *their own nature distinct from, and independent* of all civil Authority? — Let them produce their Credentials! Who would have imagined *Hicks, Atterbury, Sacheverel, and Woolston*, to have been the Commissioners of Heaven? But perhaps the last *forfeited his Commission*, by writing against your Lordship; by declaring, that he loved and honoured the whole Royal Family, and that he prayed for them *without pay*; which, if we may believe an *Infidel*, is more than any B----p in the Kingdom d.th.

It seems, they are likewise the * *Successors of the Apostles*; — some have thought them to be an illegitimate Brood, that have no Traces of their pretended Fathers Features; and tho' I can't say they work for their Livelihood, yet like many more of their Fraternity, they are obliged to the Parish for a Maintenance; or otherwise obtain *Pensions* for

K 2

keeping

* Charge 2. P. 54, 55.

keeping out of it, and residing any where but — where their Duty calls them.

However, I must not omit transcribing a few Paragraphs which have been already referr'd to, that may give further Light into this matter. -----
 “ * Agreeable to the spiritual Commission, we
 “ have received from our *great Master himself*, by
 “ the *Succession* of his appointed Church-Officers,
 “ in so many *Ages*, and by vindicating on all *proper Occasions*, those spiritual Powers that have
 “ been so derived, as in their own Nature *distinct*
 “ *from*, and *independent* of all secular Authority.
 “ These we find are maligned by Persons that
 “ either have no *just Sense* of any Religion, or that
 “ have no *Pretence to those Powers by Succession*,
 “ nor indeed by any thing but an *ill-founded*, and
 “ frequently an *enthusiastical* Call; and therefore
 “ no wonder they are so exasperated against us,
 “ when we *refuse* to give up our *distinguishing Character*, and *sink* ourselves into a *level* with them.
 “ The *sceptical Writers* on this Subject, pretend
 “ that we have derived our spiritual Commission,
 “ thro' the *impure Canal*, as they call it, of the
 “ Church of *Rome*, and therefore betray a strong
 “ Disposition to invalidate our Orders.” I would
 gladly be informed, my Lord, what these Rights
 of Succession are founded upon. ---- I doubt it will
 appear to be according to Firebrand *Tartuffe's*
 Account of the matter, the Instrument of their
 Power being thrown by *Phaeton* * * -----

I have known a *Cobler*, may it please your Lordship, that could not earn Bread by his Trade, yet has been dubb'd a Priest in our Church establish'd; and to do him Justice, he *cobled Divinity* as wretchedly as *old Shoes*. Was this *your reverend Brother*,

* Ibid.

* * *Into the Sea the Water has so damag'd it,
 That none but Priests could ever read it since.*

Rasquin.

Brother, my Lord, within the Line of Succession? If not, I suspect there will be many more upon an equal footing. But allowing these *spiritual Claimants* their Pretensions, yet what do they succeed the Apostles in? It may be said, --- in their *unacquaintance* with human Learning; but 'tis hoped none will pretend that they succeed them in the Gifts of the Spirit. They succeed likewise, in what the *Apostles never had*, ----- some hundreds or thousands a year. They succeed the Apostles too in *those very things* which they *honestly* rejected, ----- lordly Pride and prelatical Jurisdiction. When *Paul* and *Barnabas* were represented as Gods, that came down in the likeness of Men, they expressed a generous Indignation at the mistaken Homage that was paid them. But their *Successors*, it seems, assume the *Image of Gods*, and refuse to give up this *distinguishing Character*, so as to sink themselves into a level with Men. They must be sceptical with a witness, my Lord, who dare presume to call the *Church of Rome* that *holy infallible Mother*, an impure Canal, thro' which you derive your Commission? A Church impure that abounds with *pure unsophisticated Wines and Gold*! These *sceptical Writers* are a *Tribe of crazy Enthusiasts*. 'Tis an *impure Canal*, as they call it, but *your Lordship* knows better things.

Thus, my Lord, as far as comported with my Design, have I examin'd the most remarkable Particulars in your *two Charges to your Clergy*. My View has been to do Honour to *Christianity*, and as far as is *consistent therewith* to your *Lordship*. What has been advanced, proceeds from the most sacred Regards to Liberty, to Virtue, and to Mankind. If, my Lord, you should think it necessary to have some Animadversions upon what is written, the Author begs leave to inform you, that he'll be always ready to hear what is offer'd by Men of
distin-

distinguishing Character ; but shall think himself above taking notice of any *hired Miscellanists*, that retail Stupidity and Scandal. Wishing your Lordship a *happy and speedy Translation* in this World, I don't mean *to the next* : I have only to add, that if convinc'd of any Mistakes in what I have advanced, believe me, my Lord, I shall publicly retract, and as publicly subscribe myself, the very Reverse of Ecclesiastical Subscribers, sincerely, and without Pay,

YOUR LORDSHIP'S

Most dutiful Son and Servant,

in the Bonds of Uninterrupted

Succession and Infallibility,

A Revolutionary Tory.



Lately Publish'd,

PHILEMON to HYDASPES, relating a second Conversation, with *Hortensius* upon the Subject of false Religion, in which is asserted, the general Lawfulness of Pleasure, and the extravagant Severities of some religious Systems, are shewn to be a direct Contradiction to the natural Appointment and Constitution of Things. In two Parts.

Printed for *M. Steen*, in the *Inner-Temple-Lane*.

